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I have reviewed the manuscript, "Sociodemographic correlates of urine culture test utilization in Calgary, Alberta." by Griener et al.

General Comments

1. The study examines urine culture practices in a single city, Calgary, using strong methods from a large database. This study is novel in that it looks at a very large database and has some novel findings, especially that persons of lower socioeconomic status receive markedly less urine culture testing. There are many strengths to the study, including the fact that the city's uses a single microbiology laboratory to help track urinary cultures.

2. The manuscript is well written. The methods are very strong.

3. Some results, like the association between income and urinary culture testing are quite interesting and secondary analyses may shed further light on the unusual findings. The authors may wish to do some analyses, for example, of whether person of low socioeconomic status (SED) are more likely to get urinary testing in the ED, which may explain higher testing rates in this population.

Specific Comments

1. Abstract, Line 17: the term "First Nations" status is unclear to me and not clear in the manuscript. Consider another term or referencing a source for this term.

2. Page 7, line 1. Results. The proportion of culturing (e.g., 67.9% in the community) is a very interesting finding and very descriptive as it describes the population under study. These sort of results should be considered for the abstract.

3. Discussion: I think the biggest limitation of the study is that results are not correlated with clinical syndromes so it is unclear which of these urine cultures are appropriate or not. I think the authors should be more explicit about this limitation in the discussion section.
4. Other limitations include that these measures of urine culturing are probably a tad low as residents could get testing outside of the Calgary, just as some outsiders got testing within Calgary.

5. Discussion. Page 10, line 14. The authors conclusion (first sentence) should be modified to make it clear the increase in urine culture testing is something found locally in Calgary, and not more widespread. We don't know if this trend holds in other locales.

6. Table 2. The term "Visible" in "Visible Minority" is unclear. Consider another term or referencing a source for this term.
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