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Reviewer’s report:

The paper appears to have gained much from the revisions made and is in my opinion publishable. However, a further linguistic and secretarial review appears to be mandatory before publication. For instance:

Abstract: several abbreviations appear for the first time in the abstract and are not explained in the text; breast cancer is repeated in the Methods after having been abbreviated in the Background; "respect" is used for "as compared" and "despite" for "although"; the last line is difficult to understand unless "which" is replaced by "this" and the sentence modified accordingly

Introduction: reference 17 does not refer to Bonadona

Patients: Second line delete "the".

Patients’ characteristics: delete apostrophe after "characteristics"

Multivariate Survival ....: "Respect" is used for "as compared" or "in comparison"; a comma is needed after "Conversely"; "lost" instead of "loosed"; "in reducing" instead of "in the reducing".

Factors associated ....: "being alive" instead of "being to be alive"

Discussion: page 9, second line: a word like "greater" or similar is missing before "protective effect".

These are only a few examples and I think this important paper deserves an optimal level of the English language and an editorial review before publication.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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