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Reviewer's report:

Section: Abstract
Major Compulsory Revisions (none)
Minor Essential Revisions:
1) Is “mother tongue” another term for native language or primary language? Could this term be defined or changed, e.g., “mother’s native tongue” so that it is more appropriate for readers outside of this study’s country.

Discretionary Revisions: (none)

Section: Introduction
Major Compulsory Revisions (none)
Minor Essential Revisions (none)
Discretionary Revisions (none)

Section: Methods
Major Compulsory Revisions (none)
Minor Essential Revisions:
1) See suggestion above for “mother tongue” variable.

Discretionary Revisions (none)

Section: Results
Major Compulsory Revisions:
1) Page 8 lines 177-178: The authors mention this state to summarize the results for similarities found between number of respondents and the distribution of the demographic characteristics:

Nevertheless, the overall number of respondents as well as the distribution of demographic characteristics was similar in both birth cohorts (IRR 1.02, 95% CI 0.97-1.08).

Is the IRR presented to best characterize these associations? It appears to be the IRR for the “year of birth” variable from Table 3? Please explain.

2) It would be good to provide the table for the SWLS estimates, as these results are highlighted as a major finding in the abstract and in the Discussion.
Minor Essential Revisions (none)
Discretionary Revisions (none)

Section: Discussion

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1) Are there any additional limitations or strengths to the current analysis that could be noted? Have there been any other studies that have used the inverse probability weighting or the multiple imputation method to compare with, in a similar study design?

Minor Essential Revisions (none)
Discretionary Revisions (none)
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