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Author’s response to reviews:

We profusely thank the Editor and the reviewers for their further input to improve and finalize our manuscript. We have striven to answer all queries raised, and our responses to individual queries/comments are provided below:

Editor Comments:

1. In the Authors’ contributions subsection of the Declarations, please remove the numerations behind each contributions (i.e. Research Project: “A”, “B”, “C”) It is preferred that authors contributions are written in paragraph format (i.e. DR wrote the first draft of the manuscript. TC and PU provided critical revisions to the manuscript. etc”)

Authors contributions – lines 414-416 page 18

DR conceptualized, executed and performed the statistical analyses of the study and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. PU and TC organized and supervised the project and critically revised the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

2. Submission of a manuscript to a BioMed Central journal implies that materials described in the manuscript, including all relevant raw data, will be freely available to any scientist wishing to use them for non-commercial purposes, without breaching participant confidentiality. Thus, we request that you upload English language versions of all questionnaires developed specifically for use in this study as supplementary files. If the questionnaires are not yours or are already published by you, please supply references and/or links to them.

The template of the questionnaire (with ethical review clearance) is now submitted.
Availability of data and materials – lines 401-402 page 17

The datasets generated and analyzed during the current study are with the corresponding author, which can be made available upon reasonable request.

3. Please carry out the final revisions suggested by reviewers. Included below.

BMC Neurology operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Johannes Schlachetzki (Reviewer 1): The authors have sufficiently addressed my concerns.

Minor points:

Figure 1: The x-axis should nevertheless be labeled.

Overall, in Figure 1, the x axis shows the different groups of PD individuals and the controls recruited in the study. Therefore, the axis was labelled as ‘Subject group’

Instead of "disease control", the authors may want to think about other terms, e.g., as they wrote in the abstract as "other neurological disorders" and is more specific than "disease control".

The term, ‘disease control’ was replaced by ‘individuals with other neurological disorders’ where applicable

In the acknowledgements, please remove the word "normal", instead just use "Controls".

This was done.

Acknowledgements lines 419-420 page 18

The authors wish to acknowledge the Parkinson disease patients and the controls for participating in this study.

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 2): "REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:
Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? Yes

Reviewer comments: The author addressed all concerns raised by me."