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Dear Editor,
The manuscript has been revised according to the suggestions of the reviewer. Also, the final version has been read through and discussed by all co-authors. Discretionary revisions:
1. Discussion Paragraph 8: The wording has been changed, and the term over-/underestimation is not used anymore.
2. Figure 1: The uppermost box has been deleted.
3. Conclusions: Part of the section has been incorporated into the Discussion section.

Additional revision:
Figure 3: After discussion with statisticians, logrank test was re-introduced to compare the Kaplan-Meier curves for “Year”, and the result is given in the graph (as in the initial manuscript). We considered that the assumptions of the logrank test (proportional hazards) were not violated based on the depicted “sample” curves that are somewhat superimposed and not clearly crossing.

Yours sincerely,
Dr Erik von Elm