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Reviewer's report:

General comments
I believe the subject matter, the analysis and the results are of interest. The authors appear to have completed major revisions. My comments are about minor revisions.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. None: the authors have responded to prior comments

Minor Essential Revisions
2. While the text is generally clear, there are several minor errors and a couple of sentences that are unclear. These could be fixed by a proofreader. I have listed those I identified below.

3. Abstract, p. 2 line 10: change study 'for' to study 'of'
   line 14 delete 'approach'. It is not needed

4. Background line 10 delete "the"
   line 14 should be respondents; line 19 change accuracy on to accuracy of
   p. 5 line 7 add be 'may not be valid'
   line 7 and 8 change understanding to information
   line 9 add has 'literature has focused'

5. Measures
   p. 6 line 18 change by themselves to for themselves
   p. 7 line 1 and 2, the last sentence of the paragraph on the prior page. This does not make sense or is at least unclear and should be rewritten.

6. Statistics
   p. 7 lines 14 and 15, this sentence is unclear and should be revised

7. Results
   p. 9 line 1 delete 'were'
   lines 4 and 5 sentence starting "Non-random...." is unclear
line 9 delete "was found to be"
line 17 add "even after propensity score matching."

8. Discussion
p. 10 in lines 16 and 18 respondent should be respond
line 23 add These so it is These major confounders
p. 11 lines 1 to 3, this is your assumption/interpretation so the wording should reflect this. For example, "it seems" or we believe, proxies are more likely
line 18 should be revised to say "this questions is about an activity that is private. It is the activity not the question that is private.
p. 12 line 2 add the 'most of the existing studies'
line 4 change the to this--according to the findings of this...
line 5 change better to improve
line 8 delete 'in the confounding variables'
line 16 delete two groups and say what they are

Discretionary Revisions
None

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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