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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

[1] The conclusion is limited and doesn't discuss any of the limitations of the methodology or data.
[2] More work needs to be done to explain the basic idea of the OB regression model as it is not clear

Minor Essential Revisions

[1] page 4, remove "The" on the first line.
[2] page 4, line 3, no need for comma "in 2000 and 2001 respectively"
[3] page 4, line 5, growth of "the" economy
[4] page 4, line 9, consider rewriting "to guide what we may expect..." to "so as to forecast future growth in spending following the economic recovery"
[5] page 4, line 13, (remove "to") more systematically examine
[6] page 4, line 13, are you sure there are no similar papers as this may have been discussed indirectly in forecasts of future medicaid spending.
[7] page 4, line 18, same study period, should be "same period" and without comma
[8] page 5, line 1, "in predicting" instead of affecting
[9] page 5, line 4, in "the" early 2000s
[10] page 5, line 16, due to "the" change
[11] page 5, line 18, Their "work has" not works have
[12] page 6, line 1, "Because the hospital"
[13] page 6, line 2, largest provider "of health care in the US whose spending comprises"
[14] page 6, line 3, we focus on the "factors"
[15] page 6, line 4, "in" the hospital sector
[16] page 6, line 9, define PPS
[17] page 6, line 15, did you mean medicare and medicaid?
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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