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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript reports an interesting piece of analysis, focussing on patients who generally receive less aggressive treatment for AMI, an important subgroup of AMI patients. My review concentrates on the statistical methods employed. The method used, Cox regression, is a suitable one, although there are alternatives such as survival analysis with the inclusion of propensity score matching. I assume that the cohort comprises patients from several hospitals. There could be more detail about this if it is available. I am concerned that both case mix and care varies by hospital and that it would have been appropriate to have included a shared frailty term to account for this. The case for follow up limited to 9 months is made and suitable adjustment has been made for most potential confounders, other than shared frailty. Are details of medications prior to AMI also available? It would be interesting to try to understand the differences between the three groups, for example why the rate of hypertension is higher in the DAPT group. For a Cox regression, I would expect a test for proportional hazards to be undertaken, but see none reported. The conclusions are based on observing one statistically significant result among the six reported in Table 3. Yet no comment on multiple testing has been made. As a consequence the findings might be overstated. Generally I commend the authors on this work although I would like to see addressed the issues of shared frailty, testing for proportional hazards, and multiple testing.
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