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Reviewer's report:

General
My comments have been addressed adequately, with one minor exception (see below under Discretionary revisions).

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)

The heading of table 3 does not explain the second half of the table (sociodemographics). The heading addresses only the comparison between the cohorts. As I interpret the table, the second part is not a comparison between the cohorts. The explanation in the text in the final paragraph of the Results makes it easier to understand the table, but I think it would be good if the heading were changed to better describe what the table shows.

When rereading the manuscript after the revision, I notice something in the beginning of the results that I ought to have commented in the first review: The response rate for the new cohort is stated do be 688 out of 854. But there were 971 individuals ascertained on the sample date according to the first sentence under Results. One was excluded due to language ineligibility and 8 not traced. But what about the other 108? I apologize for not noticing this in my first review!

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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