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**Reviewer's report:**

- The authors posed the question well enough, although there are some points in the manuscript that I think needed adjustment (Minor Essential Revisions) in order to specify better the concepts. For example in the Results of the abstract the authors wrote: “Deaths among females accounted for 71.5%.”. I don’t understand if this phrase refers to the BM or PM as an underlying cause and as an associated cause. (Minor Essential Revisions)

  Another moot point in the results is when the authors wrote “There were no conditions of the esophagus mentioned or listed as associated causes (Table 2)”. About this phrase I don’t understand if the word “esophagus” is refers to tumor (neoplasm) or to chronic degenerative disease, I think that it is better explain this point. (Minor Essential Revisions)

Moreover, when the authors spoke about the tumors classification I think it is more correct to write " a neoplasm classified as being of uncertain or unknown behaviour " rather than opens " a neoplasm classified as being of uncertain of unknown behaviour". (Minor Essential Revisions)

Why in the Discussion the authors compare two different period: the 1959-1961 period liken to the period 1985-2007 which is in the studio? (Minor Essential Revisions)

- The authors described methods and statistical analysis appropriate and well.
- The data are sound because describe the long period of time (23-years)
- The manuscript adhere to relevant standards for reporting and data position
- The discussion and conclusions are well balanced and adequately supported by the data
- Unclear sentences were described in section 1
- The authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished
- I think it is better to improve the conclusion of abstract (Minor Essential Revisions)
- I think the manuscript is acceptable

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable

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