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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled. "Developing outcome, process and balancing measures for an emergency department longitudinal patient monitoring system using a modified delphi"

Abstract
1. Appropriate and reflects the article

Background
1. Appropriate and provides a good background to the study.

Methods
1. The study design is well described, possibly with too much information provided regarding 'yield' of each stage or step. The specific yield should be removed and included in the results section.
2. The methods is quite wordy, and could be presented in a more succinct way. Removal of some of the 'results' will assist with this.

Results
1. Interesting and well described under the three main sub headings. A description of the flowchart would be better placed in this section, as described previously.

Discussion
1. The discussion reads quite well and appears to reflect the findings.

References
1. Appropriately listed

Tables
1. Tables are both reasonable and add to the manuscript.
2. Figure 1 useful.

Overall, an interesting study which will be of interest to the ED audience.
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.

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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