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Reviewer's report:

I am satisfied with the corrections that have been made, which I think have improved the article. In my opinion it is ready for publication.

For the sake of readability, I suggest a few small additional changes:

1. Page 6, line 7, refers to "Wits University". I would suggest that given this is the first use of this abbreviation, it should be stated as "University of the Witwatersrand (Wits)".

2. Also on page 6, in the text at line 14 and the explanatory footnote, the term "coloured" is used without explanation. While I am cognisant of the fact that it is very difficult to define, and its use and definition is contested, the fact that in many countries "coloured" has been used in the past to denote African or persons of colour more generally, some explanation should be provided, probably in the footnote where previous racial classifications are being described, so that the term "mixed race" could be used in relation to historical descriptions.

Note that the superscript "a" for the footnote should follow both African and Coloured in the text.

3. Page 11, lines 4-5, provides a definition of district hospitals that is still not accurate in my opinion, as the role of district hospitals provide a comprehensive generalist service, which is not captured by the term "limited specialist medical services"; however, if the definition comes from the source that is cited, it can remain as is.
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