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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

-----------------------------

Bonferroni correction: I welcome the mention and the inclusion of this. However, I am unclear what the actual implementation of the correction is. When applied this should be highlighted and show the impact on the decision on whether a difference is statistical significant or not.

Lines 265-267: Could the ESS figures be added to the table if we are going to refer to them. Also, the 'fact' that 2 figures are not statistically significant does not mean that they are similar.

Table 2 and 3: what is the p value for trend? This should be clarified in the methodology section in terms of what hypothesis is being tested. In my head, this is simply an omnibus test to check whether all the differences between the 3 groups are all different from zero. Also, can we keep the number of decimal places constant. The 123 footnote (I guess only for the BMI) makes no sense.

Table 3, footnote 123: There is a 'witch' there.

Table 3, footnote c: Where were the non-SA group excluded from this analysis? And if so, how do footnotes a and b come about - what is the test?

Table 4: I don't understand the role of the Mann-Whitney and the ANOVA testing.

Multiple logistic regressions: I would really like to see some sort of model assessment to support the conclusions. For example, what is the goodness of fit for these models? Are they any good at explaining the dependent variables? Also, why were continuous variables dichotomised for the models (e.g. Age)? Isn't using continuous variables more robust?
Minor Essential Revisions

--------------------------

It would be good to have more information (e.g., a table) on the statement that "Although the inclusion rate for eligible patients for study analysis was 772 (75%), the inclusion design was consecutive, and there were no significant differences in baseline characteristics with regard to comorbidities." This is quite a substantial drop rate and it would be good to reassure the reader that the excluded have the same characteristics as the included.

Line 225: Instead of "multivariate logistic regression" it should be "multiple logistic regression" or just simple "logistic regression". Multivariate means multiple Y variables. In page 16, this is correct.
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