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The authors have responded to my concerns to the extent that it is possible without gathering additional data. I am satisfied that they have addressed these concerns adequately.

There are a number of small typographical errors in the manuscript that should be corrected. One of these appears below

The utilisation of emergency services has risen worldwide [1, 2] due [to] demographic changes and increasing demand [1].

- Minor Essential Revisions

Based on your assessment of the validity of the manuscript, what do you advise should be the next step?

- Accept without revision
- Accept after discretionary revisions (which the authors can choose to ignore)
- XXX Accept after minor essential revisions (which the authors can be trusted to make)
- Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions
- Reject because scientifically unsound
- Reject because too small an advance to publish (note that BMC Health Services Research will publish all sound studies including sound negative studies)

Level of interest -------------

BMC Health Services Research has a policy of publishing all scientifically sound research whatever its level of interest. However if you choose one of the first three categories below, we may ask the authors if they would like the manuscript considered instead for the more selective journal BMC Medicine.
An exceptional article (of the kind that might have warranted publication in such journals as Nature, Cell, Science, New England Journal of Medicine, British Medical Journal)

An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field (of the kind that might be found in the leading specialist journal in its field, such as Immunity, Development, Journal of Clinical Investigation, Gastroenterology)

An article of importance in its field

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

An article of limited interest

An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

Quality of written English

As we do not charge for access to published research, we cannot undertake the costs of editing. If the language is a serious impediment to understanding, you should choose the first option below, and we will ask the authors to seek help. If the language is generally acceptable but has specific problems, some or all of which you have noted, choose the second option.

- Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
- Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review

Is it essential that this manuscript be seen by an expert statistician?

If you feel that the manuscript needs to be seen by a statistician, but are unable to assess it yourself then please could you suggest alternative experts in your confidential comments to the editors.

- Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
- Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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