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Reviewer’s report:

Major comments:

The manuscript improved remarkably by changing the focus from combining into comparing.

It is still unclear for me, after reading the summary, on which results the conclusion is based that definitions based on drugs use alone give the most reliable results. Do the authors know for which condition the drug was prescribed? And was this indeed the indication to which the authors ascribe the drug?

I still feel some hesitation about the results regarding obesity. If I look at the results, my conclusion would be that comparing different databases does not give a better indication of true prevalence, just information that prevalence is different using different source, and that is is unclear which source is representing the truth.
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