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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to read this paper. As requested by the editor, I have specifically commented below on the statistical approach employed in the paper.

The statistical model used OLS regression to estimate the effect of SUD clinic funding on monetized clinic workload and adjusted for fixed effects of year, clinic and their interaction.

1. There are two issues not modelled that may have impacted upon the statistical significance of the results - serial correlation and cluster effects. The data are time series in nature and it is likely that timepoints (errors) are more similar the closer they are in time. This may make the standard error of effects over precise and so inflate significance. Similarly the clustering of data within clinic may impact. This was modelled using fixed effects for clinics but it would have been useful if a random effect had been investigated. Again this would impact upon the standard error. However neither of these models are straightforward and the existing model does adjust for time and clinics (albeit suboptimally). So i do not think the model is fundamentally flawed but more discussion that the significance of the results may not be as strong as stated is merited.

2. Fig 2 is titled 90% CI I presume it should be 95% CI
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