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**Reviewer's report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions

I still have some concerns, especially my comments 5 and 6 regarding the Table 3. I also do not understand the utility of Table 2 as the controls were already selected by matching which will take care of covariate adjustment. So there is NO need to adjust for propensity score again.

I also suggest that Table 1 should present the all controls (entire cohort who received C-CPR) on right column, and Table 2 should be replaced by the current Table 1, presenting the matched control. This is the standard way of reporting this kind of cohort data.

The Table 3 should report the following:

- % of survived to hospital out of those who had shockable rhythm and A-CPR (the denominator=20—based on Table 1)
- % of survived to hospital out of those who had shockable rhythm and C-CPR (the denominator=78 based on Table 1)
- % of survived to hospital out of those who had non-shockable rhythm and A-CPR (the denominator=37 or 45 if other includes non-shockable rhythm)
- % of survived to hospital out of those who had non-shockable rhythm and C-CPR (the denominator=116 or 132 if other includes non-shockable rhythm)

As the study was a prospective cohort study, I would suggest reporting this instead of using the number those survived to hospital as denominator.

Same comments apply to the right side of the Table (survive to discharge)

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**

Nothing to disclose