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Reviewer's report:

General

Interesting findings.

I found the format of methods being at the end of the paper to be confusing. I suggest including a description of the population before the results in order for the reader to interpret the results.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. Adhere to the criterion of p<.05 statistical significance in discussing results (e.g., in symptom frequency in men). If your hypotheses were directional, the difference needed for significance is less than if the hypothesis was for just a difference in either direction.
2. Discussion is quite long and not directly related to results. Therefore, I suggest that it be shorten and focused.
3. Clarify what it means for the diagnosis of HH to be made in front of signs of fatigue (e.g. in result, pg 5)

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 minor essential revisions

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

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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