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Reviewer’s report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

I agreed with the authors’ conclusion that identifying benchmarks or targets regarding the optimal number of PTs, along with other health professionals working within inter professional teams, is necessary to establish a stable supply of health providers to meet the emerging rehabilitation and mobility needs of an aging and increasingly complex Canadian population. The analysis of the optimal ratios also requires better understanding the active and inactive status of Physical Therapist and the length of or reason for the inactive status. For example, many nurses leave the workforce for a period of time and return to the workforce. In determining the demand consideration should also be given to wait time to receive PT services. The authors did good a job of pointing out why a more complex analysis is required to determine what the supply needs are for rehabilitation services however, there was not much discussion of data from the demand side this data would have been helpful in making a stronger argument for this type of benchmarking. The data collected within this study are not sufficient and leaves the reader wanting more data. I also have concern that the premise of paper is to elementary.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.