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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have satisfactorily addressed each of the points raised below and I recommend that the manuscript can be published in its revised form.

Major compulsory revisions

1. Background
This section lacks for a clear differentiation between primary, urgent and emergency services. This would be particularly useful for international readers who may not understand the US context.

Discretionary revisions

2. Abstract
Whilst the purpose of the study is clearly provided in the main body of the article it is lacking in the abstract. A single sentence clearly stating the aim in the first paragraph of the abstract would assist in tightening up what is otherwise a very clear and concise abstract.

3. Discussion
As a very good example of health services research that can have a direct contribution to health service planning this study is a stand-out. However, given the context of this study and the clearly stated limitation that the results are not generalisable, it would add to the contextualisation of the study to provide some brief detail regarding knowledge translation. For example, is the information being used in service planning and, if so, how that is that occurring?

Recommendation
Accept.
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