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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript for the SAP is comprehensive, clear and easy to follow. Some comments:

1. P. 4, line 70: Says: "Superiority"

Comment: In my view this is not a superiority trial as the alternative hypothesis includes treatment differences is both directions.

2. P. 7, line 147:

Unclear how you handle multiple testing. I don’t think stating alternative analyses as "supporting" is convincing argument for ignoring multiplicity. I can live with not doing multiplicity correction but I would appreciate a better rational.

3. P. 11, line 196:

You do in general use a random effect for centre. How many centres are planned to participate? In there are several centers I think using a random effect is good. If the centers are few, a fixed effect may be more appropriate.

4. P. 12, line 230:

Explore the possibility of using quantile regression if normality assumption is questionable.

5. P. 13, line 250:

Please consider Poisson/Negative Binomial regression when patients have several complications (count data)
6. P. 13, line 258:

How is time to events recorded? Are they reliable? What is the mode of recording date of complications (hospital admission date for example?)
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