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Reviewer's report:

Berthelot and al did a retrospective cohort study using Canadian hospital discharge data from 2009 to 2012. Based on these data, ED-HSMR was calculated as the ratio of observed deaths among patients with emergency-sensitive conditions in a hospital during a year (2010-11 or 2011-12) to the expected deaths for the same patients during the reference year (2009-10), multiplied by 100. They concluded that the study revealed important variation in risk-adjusted mortality for patients admitted to hospital with emergency-sensitive conditions among Canadian provinces, and that these results should trigger indepth evaluations to identify the causes for regional variations.

This is an interesting and well-written paper.

I have the following comment:

The data analized are relatively old (from 2009 to 2012). Please mention this in the limitation section, and describe the consequences of this fact. Please explain in the discussion section how the results might be used in 2019, and by whom.

For whom and for what could these results be useful in 2019?

Do the authors assume that the situation in the provinces did not change between 2013 and 2019?

Are there any data from 2013 to 2019 that could be compared to the study results?
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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