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Thank you for asking me to review this paper again. I think the paper is much improved from previous versions. The only comments I have relate to lines 406-413 (page 21). The final sentence of the discussion section is very long and wordy and needs breaking up to make more sense: e.g. "There is a need to implement the Ideal Clinic programme described above to address challenges experienced and expressed by PHC and MOU-based healthcare providers. Such a programme will undoubtedly influence their awareness, sensitivity and empathic attitude towards patient experiences in PHCs and support efforts to motivate healthcare providers to provide quality care" or something like this.

• Thank you for the comment and suggestions. We have corrected accordingly – line 406-410

Also line 412-413: "Our sample does not reflect the views of nurses and midwives more broadly in South Africa, but rather local opinions" - might say "may not reflect." rather than does not?

• Thank you for the comment and suggestions. We have corrected accordingly – line 413-414