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Reviewer's report:

To interpret the paper, it would be useful to know the percentage of patients (by groups) treated with pegfilgrastim, since it is now the dominantly used myeloid growth factor. One could easily ask why these patients or subgroup of patients (roughly 4% of the total) were given filgrastim rather than pegfilgrastim.

It is also not quite clear how many patients were given or took oral antibiotics. I understand that it is hard to know if oral therapies were taken even if prescribed. It is a common practice now to give the patient the prescription for an oral antibiotic and advise the patient to begin antibiotics at home if they have a fever. This practice confounds the analysis in the report but should be mentioned at least in the discussion.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

Yes. To interpret the paper, it might be useful to know the percentage of patients (by groups) treated with pegfilgrastim, since it is now the dominantly used myeloid growth factor. One could easily ask why these patients or subgroup of patients (roughly 4% of the total) were given filgrastim rather than pegfilgrastim.

It is also not quite clear how many patients were given or took oral antibiotics. I understand that it is hard to know if oral therapies were taken even if prescribed. It is a common practice now to give the patient the prescription for an oral antibiotic and advise the patient to begin antibiotics at home if they have a fever. This practice confounds the analysis in the report but should be mentioned at least in the discussion.

Minor comments:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes

3. Are the data sound?
Yes. The analysis is based on very large data sets and the analytical methods are sound and sophisticated

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes the reference list is good.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes, the paper is very well written

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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