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Reviewer's report:

The authors have done a commendable job in addressing each of the previous reviewer comments. In particularly, the improvements to the description of the methodology and associated research limitations result in a much improved manuscript.

One major thing to note is that the risk estimate changes very slightly from the crude to the adjusted model (3.11 to 2.79). Therefore terms like "mostly explained" are not entirely true, as there was only a slight attenuation of the risk estimate. That is, the risk still differed, but was no longer statistically significant due to a widening of the confidence intervals following inclusion of more covariates in the models. I think there would be benefit in slight rewording of the results, otherwise the reader is potentially misled into thinking that the risk estimate went from 3.11 to 1 following adjustment, which is very different to what is actually shown.

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?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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