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Reviewer’s report:

This paper asks an important question. The study is well-framed. However, I think that the analyses could have been much better. Below are my major comments.

1) In stead of using a binary outcome whether the patient has experienced death or rehospitalization or not, the authors should consider a multinomial outcome variable with four outcomes: a) no adverse outcome b) only rehospitalization c) only death d) death and rehospitalization.

2) As mentioned in page 6 line 105, "a hospital discharge summary to be produced for every patient within 30 days of discharge". If a patient is rehospitalized within 30 days before the discharge summary is produced, the staffs may not produce the summary for the baseline hospitalization event. In such case, rehospitalized patients will be less likely to have a discharge summary. The authors should carefully comment on this issue.

3) This paper should add a robustness check table assessing the effect on sub population (for example, separate age or HCC groups). This paper should use also propensity score matching approach and assess how the effect of designating a Follow-Up varies between patients who have different propensity score.

4) The analysis should include a hospital fixed effect i.e. a binary variable indicating one of the two hospitals.

5) The first row of table 1 reads as "30-day rehospitalization and/or death". I think it will be the main explanatory variable.
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