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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
None

Minor Essential Revisions:
None

Discretionary Revisions:
In my review of the original manuscript I requested the authors to point out to the reader which level of agreement as determined by Kappa was deemed to be an acceptable benchmark for this study. The authors' comment to this suggestion was that the use of Landis & Koch is appropriately referenced and that the readership of BMC Public Health will be familiar with them. This is not the point I was trying to make. Since some explanation is given on pages 10 and 12 of the manuscript about the Kappa values as presented in Table 2, I will not pursue this matter any further if the authors feel that this addresses it adequately.

Although the authors left this unchanged despite this being listed as a Major Compulsory Revision item after my previous review, I still have a problem with 5 figures listed in the Figures legend on page 26 of the manuscript, but at the same time I was presented with 9 figures, clearly marked 1 to 9. I fully understand that Figures 4 and 5 as they appear in the Figures legend are composite figures each comprised of three individual photos (and have understood this from the onset), but the final publication should not list these three photos which make up a image set as Figures 4 to 6 (as part of Figure 4) and Figures 7 to 9 (as part of Figure 5) as currently is the case.
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Quality of written English: Acceptable

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