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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
(1) In their responses to the reviewers comments the authors provided a rationale for the cut-offs of age groups and groups based on income level which is still missing in the paper. It would be helpful for the reader to get some information about this.

(2) Concerning the analyses of the data it remains the problem mentioned by all three reviewers that the authors do not clearly state what kind of statistical analysis has been used besides linear regression analysis which has been added now. Therefore, more information should be provided than just p-values, including the type of test that was performed (chi-square), the chi-square-value, degrees of freedom etc. Without these informations no valid conclusions can be drawn from the data provided.

(3) Another problem is related to this point: it would be helpful for the reader to know on what the authors base their conclusions concerning specific group differences (e.g. standardised residuals of the chi-square-test?).

(4) Concerning the multivariate linear regression analysis, which has been added in the revised paper, some more information has to be provided (F, R, R2, B, SE B), which is indispensable to draw valid conclusions.

Minor essential revisions:

(5) As the data concerning the employment status, living setting, and the (mental) health professionals are (for good reason) still not completely presented it would be helpful if the authors could mention that the data can be provided/obtained on request.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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