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The paper has improved a lot. I have some remaining minor comments:

1) Methods part, page 13, last paragraph:
   You wrote: “scored significantly lower on perceived health”. Which statistical test was used to verify the statistical significant differences between responders and non-responders? If p values are not available (as you wrote in author’s response to review), you can add the values from the statistical tests you used.

2) Discussion part, page 19, last paragraph:
   You wrote in author’s response to review: “Possible reasons for low response could be the length of the survey questionnaire and the small reward.” I think this sentence should be added to the manuscript.

3) Figure 2: The figure would be more clearer for the reader, if the data concerning the non-existing symptoms would be deleted. Then it would be easier to read the frequency of the symptoms.

4) Discussion part, page 19, first paragraph:
   In author’s response to review you wrote: “This definition (the definition of vicinity) leaves some room for subjective interpretation and can be a factor for this poor association (the association between self-reported proximity and geo-coded distance). I think this issue should be also mentioned in the manuscript.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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