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Reviewer's report:

General The thorough discussion of the CCI leaves the reader to make his own decision on the merits of the index.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore) The only suggestion I have relates to the repeated mention of clinical trials. The last time I checked out RTCs they were using ECOG or Karnofsky, so the authors should justify why the Charlson might be better.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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