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Reviewer's report:

I thank the authors for reviewing and responding to the comments.

I think they have addressed and answered the questions and improved the clarity of the manuscript. However, there is still a minor point in the last paragraph of the Results.

The narrative is still difficult to understand the evolution of ED visits. Figure 3 shows that prior to transitioning, the odds of FPSC ED visits were indeed increasing. And following the transition, there is a slight overall increase (with more notable increase for the late adopters). Hence, it seems that the overall trend was to increase, although relatively stable following the transition. But, the description in this paragraph is talking about "a minimal decrease, but statistically significant".

This can still be confusing. Perhaps a rewording of this section can offer more clarity to this section. Do you mean that the odds of ED visits increased at a slower pace/rate following the transition?
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