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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is much improved and the authors have addressed my concerns by providing more information.

Discretionary

I note that the authors do not think it is necessary to give a full explanation of the SMS randomized intervention and the editor has been asked to make a decision on this. In my view, it would be better to be transparent and acknowledge the parallel study in the methods section, even if the authors explain that they do not believe this study had any effect on the results.

The authors have provided more information in sampling and sample size, but do not explain the sample size calculation. I would prefer to see the sample size calculation included so that it is explicit what effect the study was powered to detect - especially since sample size is noted as a possible limitation.

There were a few sentences for which I felt the language could be improved. The are:

Lines 229-233 (missing a word or two?)

Lines 239-242 (missing a word or two?)

Lines 250: do you mean Stata SE?

Lines 298-301: replace "confounders" with "association"? and add "the" health behaviors "that"

Lines 302-303: "suggesting little confounding by additional controls" is a bit awkward - perhaps reword?

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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