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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

In the methods section, the statistical explanations need to be expanded. For example, the authors should explain to the reader what tetrachoric correlations are and how they differ from normal correlations. Also it is not clear where a logistic regression analysis was used in the manuscript (is this shown in figure 2?). If a logistic regression was used then the reader would benefit from a table summarising the results.

The response rate was only 53% and the authors should incorporate the impact of this fact on their discussion/conclusions.

There are some p-values associated with percentages – for example, page 8, 3rd paragraph – and I am not sure which statistical test was used to determine these.

Minor Compulsory Revisions

Page 5 – It would be useful to state if the authors would add what the CNIL is, the French data protection authority, for completion.

Page 6 – Why was a median test used?

Page 7 (and other pages) – The number of decimal places in the document should be standardised. We have some p values with 4 decimal places, whilst others have only 2. I would select 2, since 4 gives a sense of precision, which is false.

Table 1 and 2 – I don't really understand why there are more voice disorders (table 2, N = 3,904) than participants (table 1, N = 3,646). My understanding is that some people have more than one voice disorder. If this is the case, then the chi-square test in table 2 (or any other test) is incorrect, since the data points are not independent from each other.

Figure 2 – What are negative/positive diagnosis?
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