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We would like to thank you for your valuable feedback. We have reviewed the comments and our responses are provided below.

First, as you pointed out, our study [1] was retrospective in nature, which implies certain biases and limitations, such as the potential for incomplete data capture. However, these are not issues exclusive to our study but rather are intrinsic to all retrospective studies. We discussed the limitations of retrospective studies, including unmeasured covariates, in the Discussion section and emphasized the importance of further prospective studies in the conclusion of the paper. We agree that overcoming the limitations of retrospective research requires prospective studies.

Second, informed consent is often waived in retrospective studies. This practice is also common in OMOP CDM research, and such studies have been published in high-tier journals without issue [2,3].

Third, you expressed concerns regarding the potential for re-identification with an anonymized CDM. While this risk does exist, our study mitigated this by analyzing only aggregated statistics (without sharing patient-level data) and maintaining anonymized data within the institution.

Fourth, regarding covariate selection, we based our choices on a previously published paper in the Journal of the American Heart Association, which included the expert opinion of anesthesiologists [4]. Moreover, we described all covariates for matching, including the target, comparator ratio, and caliper. In addition, we examined the adequacy of matching using the absolute standardized difference in baseline characteristics before and after matching.

Fifth, all subgroups were predefined except the cancer subgroup, which was added during the revision process following the reviewer’s suggestion.
Lastly, the use of the OMOP CDM for meta-analysis, as conducted in our study, is widely established and has been employed in top-tier journals, such as *JAMA Psychiatry* and *Annals of Internal Medicine* [1,2]. Furthermore, the subsection on statistical analysis included in the Methods section provides a detailed account of the meta-analysis techniques and software employed.

We hope that our responses adequately address your concerns and we appreciate the opportunity to clarify these points.
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