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Reviewer's report:

I appreciate the edits to the manuscript as they have largely clarified both the methods and results. However, I believe additional minor edits are still required to the results. Specifically, pg 7, lines 33-38, the authors state "cases presenting later in the clinical course of disease were MORE LIKELY to have experienced..." Similarly, on pg 7, line 57, they state "Left-truncation of the simulated data showed that care-seeking bias results in LONGER mean cough duration..." These comparative statements of "more likely" and "longer" should be accompanied with appropriate corresponding statistics (like p-values) to demonstrate the observed results were statistically significantly different (as opposed to caused by random variation). While the statistical analysis should be relatively simple and straight-forward, it is critically important to be included.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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