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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Authors used "hot deck" method to impute for the missing data. Multiple imputation methods are more commonly used and theoretically better method. I propose multiple imputation to be used.

Authors describe well three groups of explanatory variables: predisposing, enabling, and pregnancy related. However, the structure of these variables was not taken into account in modeling. It would be very useful to show directed acyclic graph (DAG) of variables. It could be possible that DAG could reveal some interesting structures of explanatory variables. It would also help reader to understand the data better.

In table 3 it was a bit unclear how adjusted visits were calculated. Please clarify details.

There were 9 clinical centrals. Was there any differences between centers. Did authors consider taking clinical center into account in modeling as random effect?

Minor Essential Revisions

Discretionary Revisions

Tables 1 and 2 could be merged to give better insight of data.

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: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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