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**Reviewer’s report:**

I think the manuscript is now much improved. Most of the issues raised have been dealt with appropriately.

My only remaining concern is that the data was collected by a staff member who set up the initiative that was evaluated. In my view this casts serious doubts on the independence of the evaluation and the value of the paper. I accept that the analysis was done by others but they had to work from the material gathered by someone who could be regarded as having a conflict of interest. I think that this seriously weakens the findings - this is a shame because the paper focuses on an important topic. I would recommend that the authors repeat the study with independently collected information.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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