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Reviewer's report:

The authors have provided a thoughtful and appropriate response to my initial review. The revised manuscript seems more focused and easier to follow.

Major Compulsory Revisions: None

Minor Essential Revisions: A couple of simple editorial errors remain, so a careful read by someone who has not been involved in the paper may be helpful. For example, enrollment is misspelled as enrolment at one point.

Discretionary Revisions: On page 20 the authors are perhaps a bit hard on themselves with regard to biases acting on the recruitment process. Table 1 suggests that the recruitment resulted in a fairly representative sample, yet the authors focus on a few percentage point differences here and there. Achieving as representative a group as they did actually seems like a solid accomplishment, and the authors might wish to be a bit less harsh in their self-criticism.

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: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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