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Reviewer’s report:

General
The authors have responded effectively to the comments made by the four reviewers. The purpose and structure of the paper is much more clear. There is much more effective use of the data on symptoms (the primary independent variable) than in the earlier version. The tables and figure are clearly constructed.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
None.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
In the Results section of the Abstract, the term "univariate" is used twice to refer to what are actually bivariate analyses (p.2, lines 2 and 6 from bottom).
P.12 line 9 "rather [than] simple symptom counts"

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
None.

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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