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Reviewer: 2

Discretionary Revisions

the authors compared the use of dual antiplatelet agents in 3 ACS subgroups:

- <9 months vs >= 9 months
- <12 months vs >= 12 months;
- <15 months vs >= 15 months).

Could you consider comparison between:

- <9 months vs 9-12 months
- <9 months vs 12-15 months
- <9 months vs >15 months
- <12 months vs 12-15 months
- <12 months vs >15 months

[Thank you for the good comment.

We agree that the comparisons suggested by the reviewer such as between “<9 months vs. 9-12 months” may provide clinically-relevant data. Nevertheless, as this is a "real-world" study without randomization, selection bias may occur. For example, patients who received <9 months of dual antiplatelet therapy may be sicker and die earlier so they were unable to receive a 9-12 months of treatment.
To overcome the potential occurrence of selection bias, we thus need each subgroup of patients to be "event free" at a predefined time point (i.e. 9-, 12-, and 15-month) and further categorized them into "continuous" and "discontinuous" groups. We believe our current approach provides methodologically fair comparisons.]