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Reviewer's report:

The authors have adequately addressed most reviewer concerns.

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.

2. 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.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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