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Response to Reviewer 2

‘The authors suggest that annual male dga is higher than female dga except in 95/96. The data does not show this. In 95/96 the male dga was 266.3 female dga was 248.0’

Statement corrected. Now reads: ‘Across all years, males had higher DGA rates than females.’

Response to Editor

‘We need you to add the details of the ethical permission granted for your study, as requested in our last email. Research that is reported in the manuscript must have been performed with the approval of an appropriate ethics committee. A statement to this effect must appear in the Methods section of the manuscript, including the name of the body which gave approval, with a reference number where appropriate.’

As suggested in the attached letter from the Convenor of the University of Adelaide Human Research Ethics Committee, ethical approval was not considered necessary for this study. A statement to this effect added to the manuscript: ‘Because all data were de-identified and collected primarily for administrative purposes, the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Adelaide did not consider ethical approval to be necessary for the secondary analysis of such data.’