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Reviewer’s report:

1. Overall

The comments by the original reviewers have been taken into account and a number of improvements made. However, there are still some problems with the clarity in some sections, and I recommend that these be addressed before the article is published. I have also made some minor suggestions on punctuation and wording.

Major compulsory revisions:

2. P1
   Insert a semicolon rather than a comma immediately after “(n=26,178”
   On the same line, “following” = “follow-up”? 
   Next line “reading” = “survey”? 

3. P2
   In the corrected section, should be “function” (plural) not “functions” 

4. P7
   Last line: “based” not “basing”? 

5. P9
   The expanded description of the test is acceptable, but a fuller description of the content of the test would be desirable, especially given that the readership is unlikely to be familiar with this kind of test or the construct ‘sense of coherence.’ I suggest giving at least one example of the content of the items. Also, the last sentence could be expanded to indicate the meaningfulness of what? Life? Medical career? Etc 

7. P11
   The procedure “cross-checking with the sense of coherence” is still not clear, even with the explanation given as a comment. Part of the problem is that it appears to be part of the ANOVA procedure, though qualitative judgments seem to be involved. The reader should be able to understand exactly what was involved in the cross-checking. However, it may be simpler to omit this phrase if it
is not important to understand what was involved.

8. P12
Re interpolation: include the Piriyakul reference after “. . . similar variables.” As in the case of cross-checking, it is important to understand how the interpolation was done.

9. P12
Should “1-149.80” read “1-M=149.80”?

Minor essential revision

10. P12-13
The use of “1-M” etc for M1 or M1 or Mean 1 etc is unconventional and not clear; I would recommend changing it.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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