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Modeling delay to diagnosis for Amiotrophic lateral sclerosis: under reporting and incidence estimates

Irene Rocchetti, Domenica Taruscio and Daniela Pierannunzio

First of all, we would like to thank the Reviewer 2 for his/her careful reading of the paper and for giving additional suggestions which helped us improve (we hope) the quality of the paper. Below are the changes we have introduced in the paper following these suggestions.

Referee 2 comments

We have modified the paper according to Referee’s suggestions.

Q1 1. Regarding my Q10, Some mention would be appropriate of known reasons for delayed diagnosis for ALS: 1) the lack of any one definitive test for ALS; 2) ALS symptoms tend to mimic more common neurodegenerative diseases which must be excluded prior to ALS diagnosis, the authors state. We have mentioned possible reasons for delayed diagnosis and added some appropriate references. However, the authors’ response fails to identify where they added possible reasons for delayed diagnosis. The only changed text that I identified as a response to my question is at the bottom of page 3 and (barely) top of page 4. If this is the sum of the authors’ response to my concerns, I find their response inadequate. The authors should clearly state reasons for delayed diagnosis in ALS.

A1 We have expanded the discussion on potential factors influencing the delay to diagnosis with some references to empirical studies which turn out to be consistent with our findings. See pages 3-4 for details.

Q2 In answering my original question 9, the authors state: “The available data do not support significant differences between genders in the distribution of the delay to diagnosis.” The authors should add data showing this lack of gender bias.

A2 We have highlighted in the text the discussion of gender differences in the delay to diagnosis distribution. As the Reviewer can see by looking at Tables 5-6, the gender-specific quartiles are not significantly different, as do the retro-hazard estimates, that we have not included in the paper for sake of brevity.