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Reviewer's report:
Overall this is an well done study with appropriate analysis and conclusions.

In the discussion there is a very short paragraph on comorbidities, but it does not address this important factor in the context of race or disparities other than age. The well known higher frequency of treatment-limited co-morbidities in blacks may play a role in the testing disparity found here. The paper would benefit from a more thorough analysis of this issue.

The question of linkage to SEER data is raised in the Discussion as a limitation but then dismissed because it would limit analysis to 28% of the population. While the population-level analysis is useful, it would have been even more robust to conduct the mirror image analysis using SEER data with includes clinical annotation, and then compare those results to the population-level analysis

The Discussion paragraph on serum based tests seems a bit out of place with little relevance to this study.

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 recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:
1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests
I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal