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Reviewer's report:

General
I thank the authors for their elaborate answer to my remarks. The additions to the text made the background more clear to me.

The remarks on the sample size are still not clear to me. What is the actual sample size in the end, after ‘inflating by four’ and doubling? That doubling was needed to allow examinatiuon of subgroups, but the authors do not state what subgroup analysis were projected beforehand.

I agree with the authors that giving more than an exploration of the associations in table 3, is not appropriate.

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

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)

The samplesize should be more clear

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

p 7 top: the tendency in those below the age of 80 years: I suppose RR is meant; the 95%CI should have double decimals also.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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