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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr Zink

Thank you for the provisional acceptance of our manuscript.

We have addressed the remaining questions and comments below, and we hope that you find this satisfactorily.

On behalf of all the authors, yours sincerely

Alexander Egeberg MD PhD

Assistant Editor Comments

1. Ethics

-- Please confirm whether your study was submitted to and approved by your institutional ethics committee and include a statement to this effect in your Methods section. Please also ensure that the full name of your ethics committee is included in this statement. If the need for ethics approval was waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this, including the name of the IRB or a reference to the relevant legislation.

Response:

According to Danish legislation ("Lov om videnskabsetisk behandling af sundhedsvidenskabelige forskningsprojekter") observational studies not involving primary
analysis of human tissue are exempt from ethical review (§14, section 2) and does not require informed consent (§10).

The law (in Danish) is available here:

https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/r0710.aspx?id=192671#id200db70a-3394-4e2e-a752-c14a0f60fdf1

We have now described this in the Methods section.

2. Methods

-- Please clarify in your response this is a secondary analysis of existing data.

Response:

This has now been explicitly stated in the methods section.

3. Figure 1

-- Please state in the cover letter whether the image depicted in figure 1 is your own or taken from another source. If taken from another source please acknowledge the source in the figure legend, and if it is under copyright also state the written permission given to use and adapt it.

If the above conditions are not met the image needs to be removed. Please note the editors may request proof of permission at any time.

Should you require an alternative source you may wish to try Wikimedia Commons:

http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Main_Page

- If the map was created by yourself please include the name of the software used, whether a license was required and ensure it is correctly attributed.

Response:

Figure 1 was created specifically for use in this manuscript. The man was drawn using licensed Adobe Illustrator. The text and lines were added by the main author, using PowerPoint.

4. Funding

-- 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:

This has been added to the “Funding” section.

5. Tracked Changes

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:

This has been done.

6. Cite

-- Please ensure that all figures/tables and supplementary files are cited within the text. Any items which are not cited may be deleted by our production department upon publication.

Response:

We have now made sure of this.

7. Response Letter

-- Thank you for providing a response to the reviewers/Cover Letter. As these documents are no longer required at this stage of the publication process, please remove them from your submission’s supplementary files.

Response:

We have now removed these.

8. STROBE

-- Please remove the STROBE checklist from the additional files.

Response:

This has been removed.
Reviewer reports

Reviewer 2

The comments of the additional reviewer were, in my opinion, essential and must be answered adequately. Accordingly, I still recommend publication of the results, but I find that this is only recommended if Reviewer 3 is satisfied with the authors' responses. Otherwise, I would agree with her/his opinion, regardless of the outcome.

Response:

We thank you for recommending the manuscript for publication. We believe that there were no more comments from reviewer 3 at this point.

Reviewer 4

All of the issues have been adequately addressed by the authors.

Response:

Thank you