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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions.

1) The authors should state that the analyses were adjusted for age and gender in the statistical analysis section rather than at the end of the results (page 8).

2) The interactions tested should be listed in the statistical analyses section. The p-value for gender and social ties should be stated in the results.

3) In table 2 the authors listed the missing values for each variable. The reviewer suggests adding the following at the end of the statistical analyses section instead:

The number of records available for the multivariable logistic regression varied according to the covariate examined and/or included in the model.

4) The authors should make clear that each component of social ties was examined separate (if not, this must be clarify as by reading the description of the interactions -page 8- in the results, that seems to be the case).

5) The authors should say something regarding smoking and that its inclusion did not change the results. The same should apply to education. Please include something in the limitation of the study regarding why education could not be examined as a covariate.

6) In page 9, at the end, the authors mentioned a differential effect by age and presented OR and 95%CI. This sounds like an interaction. However, this was never mentioned in the statistical analysis or the results section.

7) In the results, if 95%CI are presented there is not need to include p-values. It seems redundant to present both.

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.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests