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Reviewer’s report:

P.1 line 24 - Spell out GP in first appearance.

P.5 line 11 (4) - East instead of east.

P.6 lines 53-55 (44-45) - Usually the authors personal contribution (meaning including their initials) should be detailed only at the end of the paper. I think that there is no need to have them here.

P.7 line 11 (49) - Can you please provide information about the spread of the participants according to the different hospitals.

P.7 line 32 (52) - Please provide the semi-structures questionnaire as an appendix.

P. 8 lines 11-35 (66-76) - Please provide more information regarding the participants' inclusion criteria, response rates, and the criteria by which the authors have decided to stop the recruitment of more participants.

P. 9 lines 13-16 (90-91) - Please explain why or according to which criteria there was no need for repeat interviews or interviewing more participants.

P. 9 - lines 25-22 (95-98) - See above comment regarding P.6 lines 53-55 (44-45).

P.9- This is a general comment regarding the results section as a whole. There are many sentences where it is not clear to the reader whether the text is being said by the research participants or as a conclusion by the authors.

P. 13 lines 11-14 (179-180)- Please explain how coordination will vary according to the threat scenario.

P. 17 line 52 (288) - Who are the senior participants.

P. 18 line 13 (295) - Please delete repeated punctuation.

P. 19 line 6 (315) - Please spell out PPE on first appearance.
P. 21 Line 37 (373) - Please spell out ICU on first appearance.

P. 28 the DECIDE steps - Please consider moving the DECIDE steps to the discussion section. Please explain what is there that is new comparing to other known existing hospital emergency preparedness/response models and what is unique about it when it comes to ID.

P. 30 Discussion - Please explain/provide evidence to the uniqueness of the research findings and the proposed DECIDE steps in relation/comparison to existing scientific knowledge regarding hospitals preparedness/response and practice models/techniques/protocols addressing other events such as mass casualties events(terror attack, road accident etc)or ID surges.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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**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.
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