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Reviewer’s report:

I am appreciated that authors respond to all my major and minor concerns as well as discretionary comments with extra efforts. This manuscript is now accepted for publication after minor revisions as suggestions below.

1. The two study aims in P7 Line 144-146 were inconsistent with those three in abstract “line 38-41”.

2. There are two kinds of unit of analysis for the study: one is hospital for inter-hospital comparison; another is patient or case for comparison between different databases. Result part of Line 415-425 should be moved to statistical methods. The link between study aims and analysis methods is a little confusing in this manuscript.

Please move the content and make necessary alignment.

3. In p43, there is inconsistent use of terminology in Table 3 and note ( “B” vs “I”).

4. In P22, line 485-487, There is no any OR=1.41 for CCI in Table 4.

5. In P23 line 515-516, Initial model showed significant difference between community and tertiary level hospital. Please check one more time for essential revision if necessary.

6. P8, the use of “gender” and “sex” is inconsistent in different database. Please check again.

7. P9, line 183, the use of victim is better to be replaced by “patient”.

8. B2-B3 versus B2B3 (Ex p 17, line 377-380) was inconsistent used across manuscript.

9. P11, line 234, “an” inconclusive zone

10. P19, line 424, there should be a comma between gender and place. “….number of cases as dependent variable and gender, place and registry as covariate,…”

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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