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Dear Dr Jo Appleford

Thank you for this second review. We have tried to change the manuscript according to the reviewer’s comments (only Dietze and Buckley had additional comments).

Answer to Paul Dietze:

Major compulsory revisions:

Regarding the adjusted effects in Table 3:

The adjusted effects are odds ratios from the multivariate analyses, which include all the variables shown in the table, separately analysed for ambulance and outpatient clinic patients. These variables are hence adjusted for each other. We have added a sentence in the table legend to clarify this point.

Regarding age differences:

Crude age analyses gave no significant differences in OR among the outpatient clinic patients, and were not included in the multivariate analysis for this group. For the ambulance group, although with a significant crude analysis, age did not confound the other variables, and were therefore not included in the previous manuscript. However, we agree that age should be part of the analysis where significant, and have now included age in the analysis of the ambulance group, see table 3. In addition, when this multivariate ambulance analyses were done by age (for each age group separately) the trends remained, but with a different age pattern for ethanol and opiates, and we appreciate your focus on this point. These differences are added in the results section, predictors for discharge (…).

Regarding gender interaction:

Gender is the most common interaction variable. We searched for gender interactions with the other variables by doing the multivariate analyses by gender, and by trying out interaction terms with gender and the other variables, one at a time, but did not find any interactions. No interaction terms were hence included in the multivariate analyses presented. According to our statistical adviser, it is common to state that such interactions were searched for (and not found), but that the details about the search methods is usually unnecessary to describe. We hope the rewording in the statistics section has clarified this.

Minor essential revisions:

Classification, first paragraph: changed as suggested.

Discussion, fourth paragraph: “…no-transferred of naloxone responders…” We have changed the wording and removed “(defined as heroin overdose)”.

Regarding the quality of written English:

The original manuscript has been proofread by a professional English editing company to ensure that the English is correct. We hope that the minor language corrections and editing during these revisions make the English acceptable.

Answer to Nick Buckley:

Discussion, second paragraph: We have changed the sentence about gender as predictor - as suggested.

Figure 2: We agree! The category should be “other illicit drugs”.

We hope these changes have improved the paper.
Sincerely yours,

Fridtjof Heyerdahl, MD
Department of Acute Medicine
Ullevaal University Hospital
Oslo, Norway