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Reviewer’s report:

1. Was any information on medication doses from participants collected? IF it was not, then it needs to be mentioned in the methods and also in the limitations of the study as inadequate dosing could cause participants to move from one category to another and would bias the results

2. In the results section in the subsection of baseline participant categories, the baseline differences between participants without aTRH and with TRH has been mentioned. After that section the baseline differences between the subgroups of non aTRH and those in the subgroups of TRH should also be mentioned

3. In the results section on the subsection of aTRH and Risk of Cardiovascular Mortality. Last paragraph where the adjusted models has been discussed.

   a. Please rephrase the second last sentence where the higher risk of CV mortality was noted in the subgroups of aTRH compared to non-aTRH group. Current language is not very clear

   b. The last sentence about non-aTRH subjects that had higher CV mortality with 3 medications compared to those with <3 medications, it needs to be mentioned that the findings while almost significant was not statistically significant. (this also needs to be rephrased in the first paragraph of the "Discussion" section).

4. In the results section on subgroup analysis, no need to mention about the subjects treated with diuretics. You can only mention those that were significant in this section

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:

Acceptable
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