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**Reviewer's report:**

You appear to have addressed the major points raised in previous reviews. The issue of "prospective" vs "retrospective" is somewhat semantic. Although many of the databases used in your study may have been prospectively collected-i.e. the underlying studies were designed before the data they reported was collected and the data corresponded to the predictors as defined by the investigators. Your study, of course, used those databases in a retrospective fashion with the specific limitation that the variables you were considering in your validation did not in fact correspond, at least in some cases, to those that drove the original data collection. This said, the reviewer finds that the terminology you have used in the manuscript is consistent and conforms with standard definitions of these categories. The reviewer furthermore appreciates the addition of the Limitation section and the more focused organization and discussion that the article now reflects.

The reviewer understands that this manuscript has now been reviewed by a statistical expert.

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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