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Reviewer's report:

The authors have done a very good job of addressing the revision points. There are a few minor recommended changes remaining that were not sufficiently addressed in the latest resubmission.

1) In the methods, it states "After 2 years of follow-up, 419 subjects were excluded from the analysis (146 deceased and 273 lost to follow-up)." Were the 146 deceased not included in the mortality analyses? Please clarify if they were excluded from the other outcomes analyses but including in the mortality analyses as it currently reads that they were fully excluded. This also requires clarification for Table 1 as the 146 deceased are included within those lost to follow-up but if they are included in the mortality analysis, they need to be differentiated.

2) Can you provide p-values for Table 1 rather than S and NS?

3) Although the significance and direction of the associations do not change between Cox and logistic regression, the ORs do change. Further, by using a logistic regression the time to death information is disregarded; there is no advantage to using a logistic regression over Cox regression as the Cox regression is the correct tool for mortality analyses.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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