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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)

Authors aiming to make comparisons between measures, but in reality they making comparisons between different wards. Statistical analysis does not exhibit comparisons between measures. As I know if you make comparisons between measures it is usually requested to compare Sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, ROC curves..

Conclusions do not respond to the aim.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**What next?:** Reject because scientifically unsound

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.