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Reviewer's report:

General
The authors addressed the reviewer comments.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
none

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Table 2: There are no confidence intervals in the Table, but the Table heading states that the Table displays confidence intervals.
Table 3: p-values of the odds ratios, and not of goodness of fit, should be reported. For example, the p-value for readmissions should be <0.05.
The authors should check the other Tables and Figures as well, for any remaining inconsistencies.
The term readmission is confusing as stated in the Tables. In the geriatric literature, readmission is used for a hospital admission (unrelated to the cause of the hospital admission) within a short time period after hospital discharge (e.g., within 3 months). Therefore, it is important that the authors clarify this aspect and they should, in all places of the manuscript, including abstract and tables, use the term "Readmission for same disase", or "were readmitted for the same disease".
The answer of the authors to my commentary No. 4 (8 patients that could have been treated as readmissions) should be added as a paragraph to the discussion section.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
none

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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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