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Reviewer's report:

The following major revisions are required:

1) Restrict the conclusion (abstract and elsewhere) to this particular hospital. Replace the term "independent" with "adjusted for ..." and add the specific covariates tested.

2) Clarify whether OC exposure was established as any OC during follow-up. If so, modify analysis to estimate HR before and after first OC, since some patients may contribute to both groups (that is, the analysis may require person-time as unit).

3) Clarify if OC treatment was systemic. If so, you may need to discuss the possible interference with the outcome.

4) Clarify which models were tested. You mention three, but only one seems to be presented in the tables. Also, it is not clear if the interaction term mentioned was the only one tested. A way to clarify all this could be to extend Table 2 with the models and terms tested, as well as adding more information in a table footnote (such as R2 or similar). If it is the case, describe in Methods the model selection strategy.

5) Amplify the sample size limitation: The CIs are wide, therefore the effects you find maybe very small (or very large).

I strongly suggest that you make available as an open supplement the anonimized dataset, the computer code for analysis and the diagnostic output.

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

No
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.

No

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 recommend additional statistical review

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