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Manuscript Title: The impact of early life factors on cognitive function in old age. The Hordaland Health Study (HUSK)

The authors have very well responded to the prior comments. I have only a few minor suggestions.

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract
1. Please correct the commas: “There is, however, a paucity…”

Methods
1. Please correct the years under “Study population”: “born during the period of 192527”
2. Also on page 6: “In the second decade of the 20th century” or “In the 1920’s”
3. Page 7: “these records HAVE been employed”
4. The sentence on page 10 is a bit unclear: “As a crude assessment of potential demographic differences between the (included and excluded?) participants we were able to trace (and) the rest of the (or excluded?) HUSK participants (and their/everyone’s?) gender, self-reported level of educational attainment and general health were obtained from HUSK.”

Do “gender, self-reported education and general health” refer to all HUSK participants, those included in the analyses or “the rest” (I believe “the rest” refers to those excluded from the main analyses of this study)?

5. Statistical analyses, page 11. Please indicate that it was parental SES in: “Post-hoc analyses were also performed to investigate whether the effect of SES on cognitive function…”. The same goes for results on page 13.

Discussion
1. Page 16-17: “Given the high number OF associations tested,”
2. Page 17: “In this respect, it IS also interesting”
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