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Reviewer’s report:

I find the paper to be well-written, of interest, and quite clear. I have only two discretionary revisions:

1. It looks to me like the secondary data outcomes reported in Table 3 were assessed on 76 records. If that is the case, you may wish to specify that more explicitly in the last paragraph of the methods section or in the analysis paragraph.

2. I would find it interesting to have the number of discrepancies reported along with the concordance for each site in a table like Table 3. This would allow the reader to assess what would happen with other decision rules.

I have reviewed the statistical basis of the report, in particular the LQAS methodology, and it is fine.

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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