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In general, I find the article much improved after the revision. It is now well written, and the title reflects the content better. I think my previous suggestions have been adequately addressed by the authors.

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes. I saw only one mistake, on page 9 in the first paragraph of the results: 'three clients dropped out of left the study': choose between 'dropped out of' or 'left' (minor essential revision)

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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