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**Reviewer’s report:**

I’ve had a look at the revised paper, and felt that the authors had done a good job of replying to the various issues raised.

As before, I'm not able to comment on the quantitative elements of the study, but have focused on the policy/practice/literature. Overall, I felt that the authors had covered the vast majority of the issues I had raised previously - and I only have a small number of fairly minor comments:

- Early on I would include a sentence acknowledging that some of the literature is based on non-UK systems and that some of the studies cited pre-date a number of more recent policy developments.

- In the methods section, the authors should state who assessed patients as 'unable to give informed consent' and how. Reference should also be made to the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act with regards to including people unable to consent in research (this would only need 1-2 sentences). I would also mention ethics approval here rather than later.

- I was uncertain how significant living in your own home was as a predictor of inappropriate admission given that 79% of the sample lived in their own home - this may be my ignorance of the quantitative element of the study.

- I wasn’t sure how helpful categorising some patients as delayed due to ‘failure to discharge the patient when medically fit’ - what does this mean and how does it differ from other categories?

- In the references, several Department of Health documents are referenced in an unusual manner ('Health Do')

Overall, no need for reviewers to see the final version in my view