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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
I remain troubled by your definition of "inappropriate" and "appropriate" visits. I do not believe it is sufficient to simply list as a limitation that the main outcome you are trying to measure likely suffers from an unknown amount of misclassification, potentially making your results quite misleading, and the direction of bias is unknown. I continue to suggest that the authors find an alternate term to describe the visits they are counting.

Minor Essential Revisions
In the abstract you state "Service provision focusing on access to primary care and EDs serving the most deprived communities would have the most benefit", yet this issue was not addressed in your paper and this is speculative at best. While some discussion about access to primary care is appropriate in the Discussion, I don't think such a statement should be in the abstract.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.