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Reviewer's report:

Thank the authors for their detailed responses.

Minor suggestions:

1. I think the manuscript is mainly focused on Visit-Wide Association Study rather than traditional Phenome-Wide Association Study. Thus I suggest not to use the abbreviation of Visit-WAS in the title. Visit-WAS is a new concept, which need to be clarified. PheWAS is not. If you use full name of PheWAS in the title, better do the same for Visit-WAS.

Actually, I felt the whole manuscript is not closely related with traditional PheWAS. The "PheWAS" in the title makes readers feel confused...since you did not do typical PheWAS in your analysis at all, you just adopt its framework to conduct a Visit-WAS (I believe reviewer 3 also got the similar confusion). The key point of the title should not be PheWAS. As you wrote in the response for reviewer 3, the main purpose of this study is "how diagnoses can be associated with visit type". The title need to be modified into something closely related with true main purpose (may be something as "Visit Types can be Associated with Diagnoses which used in PheWAS: Results from a Visit-Wide Association Study.").

2. In "5.2 PheWAS On Visit Type or VisitWAS" second page line 1: "...therefore Fisher's exact test is more appropriate then Chi-square. "

Should be "than" not "then".
**Level of interest**
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

Needs some language corrections before being published

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal

Do you want to get recognition for reviewing this manuscript? Add a record of this review to Publons to track and showcase your reviewing expertise across the world's journals. Signing up is quick, easy and free!

Yes