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Reviewer’s report:

In general, the statistical methods appear sound. A few minor essential comments:

1. In Tables 1, 2 and 5, it would aid interpretation if the percentages provided were column percentages rather than row percentages.

2. Tables 3, 6 and 7: how were the variables in the final models selected? This is not explained. It is recommended that the authors not use statistical significance exclusively to select variables in the final models. Rather, variables that are considered potential confounders should be included even if they are not statistically significant.

3. Table 6: Follow-up time has an OR of 1 with CI of (1-1). Our guess is that the units are days, which is too small a unit to be meaningful. Perhaps use weeks or months as the unit.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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