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Reviewer's report:

Thanks for this paper, it is a very interesting study. My comments are as follows:

Introduction - I think more is needed on why current instruments aren't suitable. Why is another measure necessary and why will this one be better?

Lines 127 this bit is not clear - more explanation needed.

Lines 130 needs expanded to give a little more detail. I felt a bit lost about what this meant until I looked at the results.

Line 150 - what outcome was the sample size calculation based on?

Line 158 - If triagists and calls were randomly selected, we need to know more about how this was done.

Line 166 - were the raters blinded to the centre the call was taken in? It seems not. This is ok, but should be made explicit.

Line 364-367 - I would also include this briefly in the methods. Not vital if you are struggling with word limit.

Discussion - I feel a discussion of how this paper fits in with other measures / research is missing.

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 recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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