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Reviewer's report:

Overall it's a nice paper and very nicely written. I have one substantive comment on the data analysis and a number of stylistic suggestions.

1. While there is no reason to seriously question the results, Fig 1 clearly shows that nearly 2/3 of the participants were ineligible due to lack of Fim data. I think there's a need to at least discuss why so many are missing and do some comparison of the model covariates among those with and without FIM to provide some insight.

2. Therefore the results can only be generalized to those with outcome data rather than all comers.

3. While acknowledging the linguistic inconsistency, in American English we typically say 'multivariable' for a model of a single outcome that includes multiple explanatory variables and reserve 'multivariate' for the simultaneous modeling of several outcomes.

4. There are a handful of places where authors use 'MIF' instead of FIM. Due to my own mild dyslexia I had to check this several times, but here are the instances I observed:
   a. page 6 in first sentence of MV analysis
   b. page 7 on third line of Results
   c. labels of both axes of Fig 2

5. Tables need to stand alone so please include footnotes with definitions of abbreviations and mention of stat test used to generate p-values.

6. Fig 3 Please add the p-value from the log rank test of the two levels of FIM.

7. In abstract under results in last sentence change 'sate' to 'state'.
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