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Reviewer's report:

General

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

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The authors have responded to the major issues.

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

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 authors have responded to the minor issues, too.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

The authors have responded to the major issues by changing some of the wording. It has made the paper much more congruous. There's still a nagging question in my mind about whether the SPC instrument is a measure of benefit/risk. But let's give the benefit of doubt to the authors. I think it may still be wise to at least consider adding a short paragraph to the conclusions about the limitations of the study. I'm not sure the approach the authors use to assess benefit/risk takes into account the risks of rare but severe events. Another limitation that could be mentioned is that this study doesn't look at benefit/risk compared to other options, which is really the key issue facing clinicians and patients.

What next?: Accept after discretionary 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
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