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Reviewer's report:

General

Including stage into population based cancer registries is an important goal. Therefore this presentation is of great value as it compares different grouping methods with the AJCC-SG and additionally with survival data. The authors want to contribute with their work to the discussion about stage grouping at a population level, especially beyond the pure epidemiological readership into clinical researchers.

I fear that the paper in its present form will be hard to read for this broader audience and thus the authors will not hit their point. The presentation would be more understandable when

1) It would be more instructive shown (perhaps by graphs) how the data were gained and
2) When we would get an information about the total number of cases (as it is shown for the prostate cancer cases, but placed in the part discussion).

Specific

Page 7, line 37: "as lung and colorectal cancers have a poorer prognosis". Poorer than what? Correct at lung cancer, but what is meant in colorectal carcinoma?

Page 7 "Benjamin and colleagues". Citation missing?

Page 14, line 40: Here we first get numbers of cases. This is part of "results" but not discussion.

Page 15 "HR". abbreviation missing.

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:
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