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**Reviewer's report:**

**General**

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The authors have addressed some of the comments that I raised in my review. However, the method used to determine expected number of deaths needs to be clearly specified.

The authors still did not provide a brief description of opioid detoxification regime offered at Ullevaal Hospital and how this differed from the treatment of acute opioid overdose, given that the outcomes in terms of mortality rate were similar.

The authors did not specify the patient status at discharge, e.g., completed treatment; discharged against medical advice; referred on to other services, etc. This variable is often known to impact significantly on treatment outcome in general.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

My earlier comment on the 'method' subsection remains unchanged. This should probably read 'Design'. Secondly, the material subsection under Method should read 'Participants' rather than 'Material'

The manuscript requires further editorial revision, and should be shortened.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely
related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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