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Reviewer's report:

General

In general, I am satisfied with the statistical analyses. I do have some questions and comments geared toward presentation.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Relative risk. I agree with the authors about the interpretation of confidence intervals. But why relative risk rather than risk difference or odds ratios? The justification for relative risk needs to be clear, or another estimate used.

2. C statistic. If you use this statistics, it is important to provide some kind of framework for its interpretation. Will a reader wonder if C is equivalent to R^2 from regression? You need to decide if reporting this statistic is worth the potential cost of explaining it.

3. Statistical analyses, sentence with Kruskal-Wallis test and ref 27. I do not have page numbers in my copy of the manuscript. You write

Difference between groups were tested using the chi-square or Kruskal-Wallis test.

What things were tested? What determines the choice of test?

4. Propensity score analysis. Because this appears to be a major component of your statistical analysis, I believe a summary of this approach is warranted within the manuscript. You provide a reference, but you need the summary in your paper.

5. Table 1. In table 1 you raise the issue of multiple comparisons. Please address this issue.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Nonparsimonious logistic regression. Why do you need the adjective nonparsimonious?
2. P values. Please report precise P values rather than P < 0.05. Precise P values are more informative than simple cutoffs. P values can be rounded to 2 decimal places if greater than 0.01, otherwise 3 decimal places will suffice. P < 0.001 is the lowest P value you really need to report.

3. Percentages. Throughout the manuscript and Tables, please report percentages to the nearest integer. Is 0.1% all that meaningful? The values will be easier to read as integers, and you want your manuscript to be as easy to read as possible.

Discretionary Revisions

None

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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