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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review "Access and Care Issues in Urban Urgent Care Clinic Patients"

I found the article interesting and well worth publishing.

The question posed by the authors (describing characteristics of patients and understanding drivers for choosing urgent care settings), was appropriate and well defined.

The methods were appropriate to the questions, and the data appear sound.

The discussion and conclusions were balanced, and closely linked with the data.

The writing was appropriate, and limitations were noted.

My concern is that the study is quite dated (conducted in 2000) and that the majority of references are from the 1990s. I note that the authors have attempted to connect with current model/funding issues in Boston, but this is based on a single newspaper report. Given the recent resurgence of interest in the delivery of PHC, I feel that this article could engage with this debate far more substantially - and this would enhance the relevance of the work (particularly the observations that primary care might adopt aspects of UCCs). I think the authors should more effectively draw connections between this piece of research and the current debate. A good starting point might be the seven perspective articles on The Future of Primary Care in The New England Journal of Medicine Volume 359 — November 13, 2008 — Number 20

Minor points:

p5 para 2 not sure that "non-emergent" is the correct term
p6 line 4-5 "reasons ... would be fairly inclusive" unclear - reword the sentence
p7 last sentence - Is this about all patients or participants? the rest of the paragraph is about participants - so seems out of context
p10 line 4 - and in some other places, I think should state "copayment ... was not "reported" as influential as..." Participants may be reluctant to admit this reason.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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