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Reviewer's report:

The authors have responded to most of the questions raised. There are still some points to clarify:

Major compulsory revisions

1) The way case-control analyses were performed is still not clear. How were the conditional logistic regression performed, if there was no matching of specific individual cases with specific controls? In fact, it still feels awkward that patients on warfarin at baseline were not excluded before the selection of cases and controls, especially when those patients were excluded in the Cox regression.

It would be interesting to indicate, in Figure 1 (flow diagram), that the right-hand side refers to the cohort analysis (Cox regressions) and the left-hand side to the case-control analysis.

Minor compulsory revisions

2. In results, please indicate whether it is an increased/decreased BMI that is associated with an increase in risk for VTE. Also specify the change (increased/decreased) for systolic blood pressure.

3. In discussion, the authors state that there were fewer events in PROSPER than in JUPITER, however, the incidence rates are very similar (0.26% per annum vs 0.28%). Person-years of follow-up should be reported for JUPITER, or the incidence rates be compared at this point.

Discretionary revisions

Abstract

4) It would be informative to know if it is an increased or decreased BMI that is associated with VTE.

5) For consistency, please state the p value for Scotland vs Netherlands even though not statistically significant.

6) The results of the case-control analysis are stated, but this analysis was not presented in the methods section.
Discussion

7) The last paragraph of discussion would be more efficient if it followed the fourth sentence of the first paragraph since it involves a comparison between PROSPER and JUPITER.
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