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Reviewer's report:

General
The authors acknowledge the point of their non-use of multivariate analysis but state that 'we already used the results of such an analysis for another paper that is being revised elsewhere at this moment, making us feel somewhat reluctant to insert them in the current one. We hope that you can agree with this approach or else that you may have some suggestions to further tackle this issue.' I am not sure this is entirely satisfactory. I understand the point that one may want to use the same dataset in two separate paper, one for descriptive and the other, explanatory (analytical) purposes and avoid overlap between the two.

However it seems to me still that the section that is at issue under the heading AED: self-referrals,... starting at line 18 on p8, could be done better. I suggest that the 9 statistical tests (excluding 2 for describing the two populations) were reported as adjusted (for other relevant confounders) rather than remain as unadjusted ones. This would give confidence that test results reported in this section are not subject to invalidity. Doing this should not invalidate the submission of their other paper.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The authors acknowledge the point of their non-use of multivariate analysis but state that 'we already used the results of such an analysis for another paper that is being revised elsewhere at this moment, making us feel somewhat reluctant to insert them in the current one. We hope that you can agree with this approach or else that you may have some suggestions to further tackle this issue.' I am not sure this is entirely satisfactory. I understand the point that one may want to use the same dataset in one paper for descriptive and explanatory (analytical) purposes and avoid overlap.

However it seems to me still that the section that is at issue under the heading (AED: self-referrals,... starting at line 18 on p8 could be done better. I suggest that the 9 statistical tests (excluding 2 for describing the two populations) were reported as adjusted (for other relevant confounders) rather than unadjusted ones. This would give confidence that test results reported in this section are not subject to invalidity. Doing this should not invalidate the submission of their other paper.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

None

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

None

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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