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Reviewer's report:

General
The revised paper has taken into account all my previous comments. Thanks!
Nevertheless, when I read the paper anew, I saw one additional finding that is not commented upon and therefore I ask one new question. In table I all NHP-scores for the total study population are reduced from baseline to 18 months, is the difference significant (with one-sample t-test)? If yes, it indicates a significant improvement in symptoms during the follow-up period. It would be of interest to know – add something about it if you too find it to be of interest.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes
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