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Author’s response to reviews:

Editor Comments:

1. Please include the full name of the ethics committees of each participating hospital (and the institute to which they belong) that approved the study and the committee’s reference number if appropriate.

Response 1: It is impractical to list the full name of the ethics committees of each hospital due to 2,932 hospitals included in our study. The ethics committee of Fujian Medical University provides guidance to the ethic committee of each hospital, so we have deleted the words “the institutional review board of each hospital” and have added the committee’s reference number in the revised manuscript.

2. Please clearly state the reason that oral consent rather than verbal was obtained.

Response 2: Because the structure of medical records was designed for administration purposes rather than academic research, patients were given oral informed consent that their medical record data may be used for academic research. To protect their confidentiality, only de-identified data would be available to the researchers and the data would be analyzed anonymously.

We have addressed it in the revised manuscript.
3. In the section 'Funding', please also describe the role of the funding body/bodies in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Response 3: We have added the corresponding content in the revised manuscript.

4. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files. Please ensure that all figures, tables and additional/supplementary files are cited within the text.

Response 4: We have kept the rules.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 3):

GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors conducted significant revisions to address the reviewer's comments. Except for the quality of the figures, the manuscript is ready to be published.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

The quality of the figures are still not satisfactory. It's pretty vague. More high resolution figures are needed.

Response: We have improved the figures in the revised manuscript.