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Reviewer's report:

General

The new version of the paper is more consistent with the actual value of the findings. Results are indeed promising but require further "validation".

Title, Abstract and Discussion now are more balanced and contain some warnings about the preliminary nature of findings. Evaluations about the questionnaire responsiveness are recommended.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

None

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Although the paper is quite long, a final message at the end of the Discussion warning readers about the need of further independent test on other samples, especially in terms of responsiveness, might be added as it has been done in the Abstract Conclusion.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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