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Reviewer's report:

The authors have provided a detailed and appropriate analytic description and presented their results clearly.

They have made several hypothesis tests and displayed the resulting p-values (see for example Tables 1 and 2). It would be useful to discuss multiple testing issues in this context.

Regarding data quality, the authors state that "A single clinician was assigned to make judgements about any difficult issues, and a random sample of these cases was cross checked with a second clinician." I think this is an important point and highly relevant in observational data such as theirs. However, it would help the reader to be informed of the percentage of the random sample that was used for resolving problematic cases.

A discussion about goodness-of-fit of the predictive models as well as sensitivity of results to potential outliers should also be provided.

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.
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