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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has improved a lot. Still, I find the abstract difficult to read. There are also some issues in the results section, which need some further minor revisions before publication.

Abstract

1. Merge the 2 sentences in the lines 26 to 29. The issue is that you don’t need to call it an interventional study in the 1st sentence and call it a randomized trial in the 2nd sentence.

2. It is still not clear who “managers” are? Do you mean HV who have the profession as a manager? – see abstract line 44 and also see my previous comment number 4 from initial review

3. In the abstract, it is still not clear to me from which sources the participants in the randomized trial were recruited. Please report the absolute number of HVs who were screened and finally included in the randomized trial. Please report the number of HVs who were included in the randomized trial, but not recruited from the HV dataset. Regarding the latter, I think they are included in these 56.1%, but the denominator for this percentage is not clear.

4. Were all HVs participating in the randomized trial considered for the present study? That needs to be clear from the abstract?

5. You should describe some basic characteristics of the included HVs such as age, sex etc. before you describe the identified risk factors.

6. Please describe the scale on which you measured the satisfaction. It is not clear from the abstract what 15/16 really means (line 43).

7. What is aOR? I assume adjusted odds ratio, please make that clear the first time you use this abbreviation.

8. What do you mean by “other benefits” in the second sentence of the conclusion?

Results
1. In the results section there are different denominators. I understand that 210 HVs were included in the randomized trial, but when you describe the characteristics etc. you mention 210 or 200 in the same paragraph (e.g. Description of the HC included). I assume you just exclude the missing values. You should consider only one denominator and that should be the overall number of HVs. You should report the number of missing values (also see comment below).

2. In answer to my comment number 3 under Results you mentioned that some information were missing, e.g. in table 3 the numbers of the categories sex and age do not add up to 210. Please indicate the frequency of missing values in the legend of the table if so difficult to include it. This should be done; otherwise the table lacks an inherent logic. The same applies to ALL tables including figure 2 if applicable.
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