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Reviewer’s report:

General
The authors have done a sincere effort to address the Reviewer’s comments, especially in the Discussion section. I do recognize adversities inherent with the study and how valuable data from Syria are; in such a case, however, I would rather take a more conservative and present only valid data, instead of being speculative (e.g. food poisoning).
Eventually, it is up to the Editor to decide, whether for example:
1) a regression analysis should be presented without knowing what the descriptives of the variables introduced in the models are (e.g. education has already been included in the SES score and it seems that it is also introduced as an extra variables in the regression),
2) the suggested changes in Tables and omission of figures should be made to avoid redundancy. If the authors are willing to use the WHO age group categories, they can opt for a younger age group category that will allow no essential loss of information.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Accept after minor essential 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
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