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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is original and the authors are insightful for taking on the challenge of exploring a topic of growing interest, that of defining relevant variables from a health services database. That being said, the numerous grammatical errors littered throughout the manuscript detracts from the actual writing and make the manuscript appear sloppy and rushed in its execution, almost like the authors rushed to meet a deadline and did not perform the last one to two rounds of necessary meticulous copy editing. Below are a few of the errors that stood out, though the authors are recommended to finely comb through the entire manuscript again, rather than rely solely on fixing the mistakes noted below.

"Data" are plural. "Datum" is singular. Please make the appropriate copy edits throughout the manuscript.

Line 126- "This includes record..." Record should be plural.

Line 162 and in subsequent areas: rendering care should be rendering care.

Line 222- "Because a dedicated diagnosis code for FAI do not exist.." should be "does not exist"

Line 234- "and use of accessory care options are also available and an essential." And an essential... what?

Line 238- as established by Health Insurance Portability and Accountability (HIPAA). The extra A stands for Act.
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.

Unable to assess

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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