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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

Thank you for the consideration of most comments and for the revisions performed. The manuscript is now clearer. However, few changes or clarifications may still be needed, as detailed below.

1. Regarding your responses to comments f. and g. of reviewer 1, I am not sure that your responses are satisfactory. Your response to f. was "We have added the following language to our manuscript (Lines 167-168): "Due to the large sample size and due to the central limit theorem, the sample means were assumed to be normally distributed.". However, I think this apply to statistical tests, not to present descriptive data. For instance, it is strange to read "the mean (SD) years since first symptom experienced were 13.4 (13.2)" (line 194).

Regarding multiple testing, I am also not sure that your justification is correct: "No Bonferroni or other correction for multiple testing was performed due to the preliminary/exploratory nature of these analyses, which may form the basis of hypotheses in future studies."

Can you please provide further support to these /statements?

2. You now considered this a mixed-methods study, as suggested. I think this could also be added in the abstract.

3. Regarding the information you added in the methods (page 6-7), I would consider to move most of it, or at least part of it to appendix.

4. The p-values added in the text between lines 209 and 216 are not clear about what groups are being compared. Can you please clarify this in the text to fit better with the info of Figure 3.

Thank you.
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