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Reviewer's report:

I'm overall happy with the revision. I have one final remark:

"Minor Essential Revision":

In the revised discussion, the authors state that "the focus of this paper was only on the reporting quality of LTFU information and not on the adequacy of the statistical methods applied for the survival analyses". It is for this reason that the authors have chosen not to further investigate the competing risks angle.

This is fine, as the present manuscript then follows the "all-cause survival" point of view of the papers at hand, and I do not ask the authors to change that.

However, the statement cited above should rephrased. As it stands, it looks as if there is no connection between "quality of LTFU information" and "statistical methods applied for the survival analyses". This is not true, and the authors have said so themselves a few lines earlier. If competing risks are present, and if they are not very rare, they must produce inconsistent LTFU information. Hence, one aspect comes with the other, and this should be reflected in the wording.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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