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Reviewer's report:

General

The manuscript has been improved considerably by rewriting. The authors addressed most of the suggestions made in the first review appropriately. Especially adding the research questions improved the paper significantly.

I still think that the manuscript would profit from an abbreviation of the discussion (see especially the pages 25-30), but as the journal has no page constraints a lengthy discussion could be tolerated.

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

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

1. Abstract section: “Results” has to written in bold
2. Sometimes the authors use “&” (for example on page 5). This seems rather colloquial and writing “and” instead does not add to many signs to the text.
3. Page 10: a response rate of 34 % has to be discussed in the discussion section of the paper.
4. Page 10: I do not understand the connection between the 84 clients mentioned in the text and the 211 clients nominated. Were the 211 an additional sample? Please clarify this.
5. What means “NB” on page 19?
6. The names of journals in the reference section should be abbreviated following the Index Medicus (as far as I remember that from the editorial suggestions).

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

Statistical review: No
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