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**Reviewer’s report:**

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

This is an important and timely piece of work. You are right the focus on interventions aimed at frequent attenders has seldom focused on a longitudinal perspective. If I have any quibble with you it is that you have selected patients in the extreme zone and this has led to the issues around patients who are terminally ill and so on. The more interesting group are those whose attendance pattern puts them in the upper quartile but lower than the highest 5%. However that's another story.

my complements to you for writing a clear and easily digestible piece of work.

I can find very little fault with it. You may want to change some of the headings: 1yFAs etc might look a bit confusing to the uninitiated. In the results section the first couple of lines contain lots of numbers. This could be presented a bit better perhaps as a table.

The discussion section has lots of subheadings. These are probably unnecessary.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

There are a few typographical and grammatical errors.

**Discretionary Revisions**

You may want to reflect on the notion of excluding the most frequent attenders as a separate group of people for whom it may be very difficult to reduce attendance by virtue of major physical or psychiatric pathology.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

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

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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