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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for such a thorough response to the reviews. You have addressed each of my concerns, and the revision of the manuscript is very clearly written.

At this point, I have only the following small considerations to offer:

- I was surprised to see on p. 6 that NRS was administered alone, considering this was a REPOS validation. I did notice earlier in the manuscript that REPOS + NRS are intended to be co-administered, but I am not sure it was stated that the protocol included some NRS administrations in the absence of REPOS. This fact would benefit from earlier introduction.

- P. 7 - minor typo - digit "1" vs spelled out "two" inconsistent

- P. 9 - "to relieve pressure sores" - is it possible, in your patient group, that this should be "to relieve or prevent pressure sores"?

- Please check word usage: "mimicry" on p. 10 and "plead for" on p. 11.

I am glad for this opportunity to become acquainted with your work.
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