Reviewer Comments:

Kyle

1. Good overview and clarification of the issue and your project.
2. Good use of DAGs.
3. Good presentation of descriptives.
4. Good results tables and visualizations for results.
5. Are provinces distinct enough to include as predictor? Perhaps region? This might also increase the number observations which can tighten up your error.
6. Good situating your study in the context of the emerging research.

Kim

1. Nice visuals!
2. For table give cases and person years in each group
3. Great presentation overall

Reviewer Questions for Follow-up:

1. From the DAG, age and sex and moderators rather than independent risk factors. Your exposure in your DAG is confirmed case of COVID 19 and your outcome is death. Your Cox results table indicates that you have three exposures—sex, age, and province. A DAG should be set up based on these three exposures because you are asking three separate questions: 1) Is age a risk factor for death?, 2) Is sex a risk factor for death?, and 3) Is province a risk factor for death?

Develop new DAGS (n=3) for each of these exposures. Based on these DAGs, describe how each of the other variables in the COX results table is behaving (for example for the age question, how are sex and province behaving in your DAG model?). Do the other two variables behave as confounder for the exposure-death association, a moderator, a mediator, or an independent predictor of death?

1. Run each of the models for age, sex, and province based on the DAGs you set up for each of these variables. Provide a table and interpret the results in comparison with the results that included all of them in the same model.