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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for responding to my recommendations for how to revise the article. I believe the revisions have been very successful and am pleased with the new version of the article. Some remaining suggestions for minor (though in some cases, essential) revisions:

1) the new text in places still requires a little editing here and there -
e.g. page 5, last sentence of para 1;
page 6, middle of main para (Tourangeau 'and colleagues')
page 8, end of para 1 ('data collection' methods)
page 9, middle of para 2 - references to Tourangeau and Groves should be inverted (9,7)
page 18, check sentence starting 'Interview pace has been...' 
page 24, 4 line of para 1 - delete 'and' after health status
page 30, para 2 - check 'improving process of care but less...'
page 30, para 3 - check sentence starting 'Perceived benefits...'
page 31, para 1 - check sentence starting 'Computerised data collection...'

2) on page 26, para 2, I'm slightly confused by the example and how it relates to made - can you make this clearer? At the moment it is not surprising to me that you might have different reports of sexual activity on some of these variables. What is missing is how mode differentially affects respondents in different groups.

3) on page 30, end of para 1, at the moment the text implies that the problem of mode effects is in fact secondary to the problems of overcoming ethical and logistical considerations...which it may be, but this in my mind, slightly undermines the purpose of the article. I wonder whether a concluding sentence to this section would be helpful to spell out the implication that researchers may have to explicitly trade off the problems associated with mode feature effects against the constraints on mode choice.

4) A message that I feel could be made more clearly in the overall conclusions to the article is that mode feature effects only really become problematic when researchers (or others) try to make comparisons across data collected in different
modes - either from different studies, or from different sample members in the same study. I wonder whether this point can be highlighted - perhaps in the new 'Key messages' box?
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