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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this revised version. This review has been delayed due to my holidays and to give a quick reaction I will restrict myself to the way the authors dealt with my previous comments, following the numbering in the authors' response letter.

Overall, the authors have clearly improved upon their previous version. Nevertheless I am a bit disappointed by the way the authors dealt with some of my comments and suggestions.

Major compulsory revisions

1. The authors improved upon the description of the response. However, I do not see the privacy advantage of the current complicated description of the recruitment through the TWH (numbers not reported due to small sample size i.e. # 5) above giving the actual number, e.g. 2. Please adapt.

2. I do not understand the explanation given by the authors. Moreover, they apparently did not modify the text, so the current text will still be unclear to me. Please adapt.

7. See point 1.

8. The lack of attention for the variation in duration of SCI and how this variation relates to the importance ratings by the participants is the main remaining weakness of the paper that can be repaired. I think this is a crucial point and it is very unsatisfactory that the authors did not follow my recommendation and instead restricted themselves to a very general suggestion for future research in the Discussion. Please adapt.

9. My request for discussion of generalizability is neither satisfactorily addressed: that individuals with non-traumatic SCI tend to be older and more often female than individuals with traumatic SCI is obvious, but what do the authors think this means for the generalizability of the results of this study beyond being "limited"? Please adapt.

Minor essential revisions

2. I acknowledge I asked for more information without directly asking to incorporate this in the text. So this time more clearly: please add more information about the project as a whole to show how this work fits in the larger
project in the Introduction.

5. Idem, please add the number of participants who visited their primary care physician for any reason in the previous 12 months in the text.
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