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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have answered most of my questions in the revised manuscript and response to reviewers. But, several issues should be clarified.

1. The controls in this study were selected from the authors' families and relatives. Please explain why? Would these controls have potential biases?

2. In the results section in abstract and main document, the authors described that "Statistically significant differences were found in the QoL and DoL scales between ALS patients and healthy controls. (p=0.000)." This sentence needs to be revised as "Significantly statistical differences were found in the QoL and DoL scales between ALS patients and healthy controls (both p < 0.001).

3. Due to the small sample size, the authors should describe the statistical power of each insignificant finding. If a statistical power is low, the authors should not conclude that there are no significantly statistical differences. In this situation, I recommended the authors to list the statistical powers for each insignificant result or to include more subjects for analysis.

4. The presentation of Table 1 and Table 2 are not according to the journal style. Please revise these two tables.

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

No

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:
Acceptable
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