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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes, it is very clear.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes, the statistics are very sound.

3. Are the data sound? Yes, the database is large and international. However, a couple of additional sentences on the data sources should be added (see below).

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   There is a need for more clarity on the composition of the database used.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes. However, the QI described are second generation and build upon first generation QI’s. It would help the reader if some more information on the first generation QI’s would be given, in one or two paragraphs. For example, the sentence “In addition, where there were alternative forms, we avoided the complex specifications common in many of the first generation HC-QIs in favor of more direct measures.” should be better clarified. As should a couple of other references to the first gen QI’s.

   Does this sentence: “Initially, the set of covariates used in the earlier development of HC-QIs was consulted, but because of sample size limitations in the earlier work few covariates were identified.” (p7) mean that the sample size for the development of the first gen QI’s was too small or that there was previous research on the second gen QI’s that was based on insufficient data?

   On p9: Europe is not a country. The European countries involved should be mentioned, but the data can be pooled into European data. In general, some more information on the sources and representativeness of the data would be welcome.
P17: why would some people in the field exclude the second summary quality indicator? Why do the authors not agree and think it is meaningful?
Competing interests and contributions: I suppose RSK should be KRS?
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   yes
9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes
All of the revisions suggested are minor essential revisions.

**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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