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Reviewer's report:

Most of my comments have been addressed sufficiently, except two. Both are related to the methodology.

1. The reason for choosing GLM while the data set is not appropriate for it. The authors need additional clustering procedures to make the data set suitable. There may be less complex alternatives using mixed models.

2. The discrepancy in presentation of demographic data in Table 1 and in the methods section, resulting in different group sizes (n). This problem is caused by the same additional clustering procedures as mentioned at (1).

I would not suggest to re-analyse the whole study with different methods, but rather to add some text to explain things better. For (1) I have no specific suggestion (maybe a statistician has). For (2) I would suggest to add another column to Table 1 named "whole period", and add another note to the Table 1 to explain that the groups in the last column are used for the statistical analysis.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
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