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Reviewer's report:

I thought this was a good and interesting study on an important topic.

My main reservation relates to the research methodology and the description of this. It is described as a "case-control" study when it is not. It is probably better described as a "case-cohort study".

For a proper case-control study attempts should be made to match the characteristics of cases to the controls (those who did not receive a telephone intervention) as much as possible. Instead a cohort of similar patients from the month before the study were used for comparison. I do think month-to-month variation in case mix could affect this comparison. This has also led to there not being baseline data on the control group (as you point out in the discussion).

I think this is a reasonable approach, particularly if resources were limited, but the reasons for this compromise in methodology needs describing, and the effects of using this approach needs to be explored in the discussion.

Another issue is the description of p>0.05 in the abstract - this should say - "The 30-day readmission rate in the intervention group was 11.3% compared to 9% in the control group (p=0.376); this was not statistically significant."

It would be useful to know how the sample size (62 patients) was arrived at. You say it may have been underpowered?

Could you advise on how the study was funded?

What might further research look like - how has this study informed the way further research of this type is conducted?

Having said this I think this was a good descriptive study and provides useful findings.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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