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Reviewer's report:

Congratulations once again to the authors on a well written report. They have carefully (and sufficiently) addressed the reviews of the manuscript in my opinion. That said, two issues from my review were not resolved, one of which is minor and one of which I agree should be left to the discretion of the Editor.

(1) Point 3 - I've determined from where the confusion arose regarding table 1. When I read the paper the first couple of times (and, in fact, upon reading it again to try and determine the source of difficulty) I saw the numbers as number of participants, not percentage of participants. The confusion was masked by my poor addition, summing the last three columns to 320 when in fact it should have been 300. The 133 refers to the sum total of the third column. I would advocate for presenting the actual numbers (with percentages in brackets) to help others avoid this confusion - it's unusual to start the table with N and then flip to percentages and I admit to missing the % symbol at the top of each column.

(2) Point 4 - The authors disagree with this recommendation because they argue that "The whole point of our paper is that there is a strong relationship between experiences and preferences - and if we remove half the data, this point will be lost." I agree that's the point, but disagree that it's a point that's presented in tables 2 and 3. The strength of the relationship is presented in table 1. Once it has been shown that the relationship between experiences and preferences is so strong as to be "overwhelming," as the authors claim, reporting regression analyses on both variables essentially amounts to doing the same analysis twice. Were this a paper journal I would strongly argue that publishing both analyses would be a waste of valuable space. Given that BMC publishes electronically, however, perhaps that's not a great issue, so the Editor should decide whether or not it's worth tightening the paper by exclusion of redundant analyses.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions
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