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Reviewer’s report:

My thanks to the authors for taking the time to put together a comprehensive response.

The vast majority of my points have been addressed or otherwise covered. There are some points for the presentation of methods (sampling, non-participation, and conduct of focus groups) that I defer to an editorial decision on whether further text is desired.

That the EWS was introduced as a pilot for the region in 2012 could be explicitly stated in the text (p4, ln 19).

Like the authors, I consider that the reasons for the escalation cut-offs of the EWS being changed to be an interesting question, given they were based on best points for outcomes in regression modelling. If there is a reference to why Denmark changed these points it could be of interest to readers (it is to me); if there is none, then perhaps the authors have a topic for next study?

There are a few minor typos (e.g. p12 ln 40 should be respectfully not respectful), one of which is my fault RRS on sentence 2 of intro should be RRS.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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