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Reviewer's report:

The authors do a nice job of reporting their data. In fact they do not highlight one of the important factors that could be stressed in the discussion,----a few reports of methods of assessing validity have been published but very few have addressed the type of information assessed. This should be highlighted---you did not assess just simply information to find and interpret such as gender, birthdate, side of the procedure. You also assessed elements of the surgical procedure and you identified this as more complex. This should be highlighted in the discussion. Others such as Yawn et 2005 have also stressed the importance of the choice of elements to compare and perhaps that could strengthen the discussion also.

Major--please address the elements compared in the discussion and add supporting references.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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