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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Christopher Foote,

We are very pleased that we could satisfactorily addressed all of referee 1’s initial comments on our manuscript.

Referee 2 reported that “The authors have by and large adequately addressed my concerns with this paper in their revisions.” However, reviewer 2 also stated “I am uncertain however of the appropriateness of their approach of using Cohen’s d to estimate the effect size associated with p values of <0.05.” We therefore would like to clarify our use of Cohen’s d.

Cohen’s d has been used to estimate effect sizes from our quantitative or dimensional measures. A Cohen’s d is comparable to RR or OR that can assess effect sizes for categorical measures. As such we believe that Cohen’s d is appropriate to describe the association between the organizational aspects and (non)training practices (‘the intervention’). We added a phrase (analysis section) to the paper on this subject.

We uploaded the revised paper including some language correction, and are waiting for your final acceptance for publication.

Best wishes on behalf of all the authors,

Pieter van den Hombergh
Jozé Braspenning