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Author’s response to reviews:

EDITOR COMMENTS

Comment 1- Please include a list of abbreviations after the conclusion section-

Answer- This section is now added in the final document Lines 221-241.

Comment 2- At this stage, please upload a single final, clean version of the manuscript (including all relevant tables/figures) that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours.

Answer- The final version has now been uploaded and the changes that have been made in response to the latest comments have not been highlighted, as suggested by the Editor

Comment 3- In the Acknowledgements section of the Declarations, you state that the study was supported Magnus Bergvall Foundation. Please clarify whether this foundation provided funding for the study.

Answer- This has now been clarified. The line in the previous version (Line 237) “Acknowledgements- This study was supported by Magnus Bergvall Foundation.” has been deleted. The following was added to the Funding section - “Magnus Bergvall Foundation provided funding used for statistical analysis.” which is now in Line 250 of the final manuscript.
Comment 4- Please note that listed author contributions of APC and MH does not automatically qualify them for authorship. Providing revisions of the manuscript is not sufficient to qualify for authorship.

Answer- We assure that the author contributions are in line with the ICMJE guidelines and that all listed authors have performed all four points specified in the Editor’s comments. Changes have been made in the Author contribution section to reflect this (Lines 252-256).

REVIEWER 1-

Comment 1- The authors have addressed my previous points satisfactorily.

Answer- Thanks for all the constructive comments which improved the manuscript significantly.

Comment 2- The grammar needs editorial checking

Answer- The manuscript has now been checked for language and grammar by a native English speaking academic. These changes were minor and were accepted by the authors as appropriate. No track changes are shown in the final document as advised by the Editor.

REVIEWER 2-

Comment 1- Authors addressed the causes of mortality and provided good insight into the causes.

Answer- Thanks for helping to improve the manuscript.