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Reviewer’s report:

I would like to congratulate authors on this well-written paper aiming to describe the association of warfarin and prostate cancer death. My comments and feedback is listed below.

1. pg. 5, line 75. Authors should describe how the baseline for this study was defined (i.e. date of diagnosis? date of treatment?)

2. How was active surveillance in men with prostate cancer defined? Did it also include men managed with watchful waiting?

3. The authors need to be consistent with the use of abbreviations in this paper (e.g. prostate cancer abbreviation has not been used consistently).

4. pg. 8, line 155. p-levels should be stated

5. Results. pg. 9 line 172. Authors state that a pre-diagnostic use of warfarin for 5 years or more was associated with a significant risk increase. Although the HR indicates the increase, statistically this is not significant (but it may be clinically, which needs to be discussed). The remaining HR values and their CIs in the manuscript need to be revised and their significance appropriately addressed as well.

6. It would be good to know what proportion of men actually had VTEs. This hasn't be listed anywhere in the manuscript.

7. Authors should include more information about the registry and to discuss it again other similar setting in the world. Ability to link registry data with the other large datasets is a strength of this study which also needs to be discussed accordingly.

8. Table 1 - appropriate significance tests between the groups would be beneficial.

Are the methods appropriate and well described? 
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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