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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed the bulk of the issues that I have raised, and I think the manuscript is improved as a result. However, there are a couple of issues that I think could still be addressed. I hesitate to make these compulsory revisions, but I think the authors should think seriously about them (particularly the second).

What the authors refer to as disproportionate sampling is usually referred to as oversampling. When this is done, survey weights are then used to correct the sample for this oversampling, thereby ensuring that overall statistics are unbiased. Given that most analyses are done separately for males and females, I don’t think this alters the interpretation of the results.

In their letter, the authors write “The final sample we worked with (i.e., the panel group, the respondents who participated in all three measurements) hardly contained missing data, neither for men nor for women. Hence, listwise deletion did not lead to the loss of participants”. But the final sample was arrived at by listwise deletion, because people who dropped out were deleted from the final sample.
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