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**Reviewer's report:**

The article is well written, the purpose and methods are clear, the results are grounded in data, and the discussion and conclusions follow logically from the data.

As a Canadian reviewer, I found no difficulty understanding and interpreting the context of the study. It is difficult to say if non-Canadian audiences would find the description as clear. Revisions that could help place the manuscript in a Canadian health system context may strengthen its relevance for other audiences.

The findings are not particularly insightful or novel, but interesting nonetheless. My understanding is that this manuscript will form the descriptive foundation of future, more analytical papers.
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