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Reviewer Report

The authors have addressed most of my comments and suggestions. It was stated that several comments were not addressed in the manuscript due to word limit considerations. Below are a list of original comments that the authors addressed in their response letter that would be very valuable to address in the manuscript as well; I will leave it to the editor's discretion on whether to permit flexibility in the word limit to allow the authors to address them.

1) Methods, The Study Population, Fourth sentence: The rationale for selecting a 5 mm LLD as an eligibility criterion needs to be provided. This topic is briefly addressed in the fifth paragraph of the Discussion, but a rationale for the selection of a 5 mm LLD is not described.

2) Methods, The Study Population: There are no statements on obtaining a priori REB approval, or the participants providing informed consent to participate.

3) Methods - Measurement of LLD: Clarify whether the same individual performed all of the LLD assessments. If more than one individual performed the assessments, evidence on the inter-rater reliability of the method needs to be provided.

4) Methods - Outcomes: It is customary to provide a brief description of the psychometric properties of the outcomes used in this study (along with supporting references).

5) Results: For all of the between-group differences, it would be helpful to clarify whether the differences exceed the minimal clinically-important differences for each outcome (along with supporting references).
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.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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