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Dear Editor,

We have now made required changes to the manuscript. All revised sentences are highlighted in red and responses to reviewers’ comments are shown item by item below.

Sincerely yours,
Katri Kaukinen, corresponding author

Reviewer #1
Major compulsory revisions
Method section:
2. Reviewer: My interpretation of the sentence “Nonetheless, it seemed that the proportion of control subjects with increased symptoms was similar to that previously seen in the general population [43, 44]” is that the references have shown that GSRS and/or PGWB have shown similar results for control subjects as in your paper. Neither of these measures was used in these references. My other possible interpretation is that you want to show that the proportion of control subjects with problems is similar in references as in your study. If so, there is a lack of information about the rate of control subjects with problems in your study and that information needs to be added if so. My concern in previous review round has been taken care of without this statement. You can therefore decide to either remove the sentence or rewrite it.
Response: We decided to remove the sentence as suggested by the reviewer.

Result section:
4. Reviewer: After some thinking I figured out that 2.55 is the threshold for the total GSRS score as it corresponds to the control mean (1.9) + 1 SD (0.66). I suggest that the text is rewritten so that this is easier to understand for the reader. The problem is the same for the description of the threshold value for PGWB.
Response: Text has now been rewritten as suggested (page 5, paragraph 3, lines 11-12 and page 6, paragraph 1, line 3).

Discussion
6. Reviewer: The suggested improvement is well done. I have another concern regarding these tables that I failed to notice in previous revision round. There is no information in any of the tables about how many that is in each row, i.e. how many has had symptoms for 10 years or less and so on. This is relevant information for the reader. It would also be valuable if the percentage of e.g. participants with psychiatric disease was mentioned in these tables.
Response: The number of subjects in each group has now been added to the tables 2 and 3 as a new column (see tables). We also tried to fit the percentages asked by the reviewer. Unfortunately, such a change would have made the tables too crowded, and therefore we decided to omit that information from the tables.

Minor Essential Revisions
6. Reviewer: OK. However, grammar needs to be improved. Which instead of with at line 3?
Response: Unfortunately, we do not fully understand what the reviewer means? In any case, this sentence has now been checked by a native English-speaking linguist in case of grammar errors.

Discretionary Revisions
2. Reviewer: I think that you well motivate the choice of mean values. Thank you for the clarification.
Response: No further changes were requested.

3. Reviewer: Updated text is good enough for me. However, I suggest that you rewrite the sentences to get a better flow in the text.
Response: Sentence has now been rewritten as suggested (page 8, paragraph 2, line 4).

Reviewer #2
3. Reviewer: You have stated “2% diverticulosis (2%)” at row 7. 2% has accidently been mentioned twice in this statement. I suggest that “(2%)” is removed from the statement.
Response: This typing error has now been corrected as suggested (page 7, paragraph 2, line 7).

Reviewer #2
No further changes were requested.