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Reviewer's report:

The authors have adequately addressed the issues raised in my initial review. The revised paper reads well.

Major compulsory revisions - none

Minor essential revisions:

1. Page 7, statistical methods section, line 6 â change from ârelative risks was ...â to ârelative risks were ...â

2. Page 8, lines 3-7 â long confusing sentence â break into two sentences.

3. Page 12, paragraph 3, line 8 - ?? should these figures be falls / p-year (as has been converted elsewhere in the paper)?

4. Page 19, para 3, line 5 â typo â insert âwhichâ between âstudyâ and âfoundâ so that text reads âstudy which foundâ

Discretionary revisions - 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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