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Reviewer's report:

The paper is clear and well-written. The data are old and dated back to 2014. It's difficult to justify a so large delay in analyzing and presenting results in this field.

The paper conclusion is that there is the "need for specific data collection and medical validation rather than the ICD-10-based algorithm for major bleeding assessment." I think that this is only partially true. In the discussion the authors should highlight weakness and strength of the proposed algorithm in the light of different research questions. If the data are used for building a cohort of people with major bleeding events it seems that study results justify the use of an algorithm based on ICD10 codes. If the research question is about the incidence of major bleeding events we could agree that other methods are suitable.

I do not agree with the sentence "specificity is of some importance, as it enables real differences to be revealed, unlike sensitivity."", in fact every accuracy measure as its pros and cons (Eusebi P. Diagnostic accuracy measures. Cerebrovasc Dis. 2013;36(4):267-72. doi: 10.1159/000353863)

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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