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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for inviting me to review this revised version. It is appreciated that the authors revised this manuscript heavily with reference to the reviewers' comments.

Literature review is richer than before.

Statistical analysis.

A stepwise logistic regression was used to derive the predictive model. Is it a common practice to use a backward logistic regression for verification.

Discussion and conclusion.

As mentioned before, the results deserve a lot of discussion to justify and communicate with the literature. However, currently, the discussion is only expanded in some extended.

Page 13, line 19-22. "Among system factors, reducing admission after 5pm will minimize periods when a skeletal night crew must care for patients at a time they are most vulnerable and need optimal care…". The system factors "admission of surgery after 5pm" seems a kind of administrative issues affecting both patients. However, it is very unclear why this factor was predictor and more elaboration is needed.
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