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Reviewer’s report:

This is a well-written, thorough piece of work. I have a few suggestions which I think will improve the paper.

Major compulsory revisions

Results

1st paragraph - "Following this the risks were lower than the reference population". The risk is only lower between 60 days-1 year. This needs to be clarified.

Discussion

6th paragraph - It would be useful to set a bit more context about how cancers are recorded by cancer registries, for those readers not familiar with registry practices. How much does this vary from one registry to another?

7th paragraph - "there were registered cancers that we would exclude as second primary tumours according to IARC rules." The previous sentence states that the registry follows IARC rules. Please explain this discrepancy.

Paragraph 8 - The last two sentences need a bit more explanation. Do the authors mean that those surviving cancers with high survival rates (breast, melanoma) are likely to live a long time and thus have an increased time in which to develop cancer?

Minor essential revisions

Discussion

1st paragraph - Melanoma should be mentioned here, to maintain consistency with other parts of the manuscript.

Paragraph 9 - "The association between socio-economically patterned cancer..." this doesn't make sense and needs more explanation.
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