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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major compulsory revisions:**

Thanks for correcting the labels of males and females in Table 3.

I disagree with your statement that there was only an inversion among women and men in the table. Indeed, there was an inversion among women and men in the table, which means there should also be an inversion in Odds ratio's. It should not be 3.14 but 1/3.14 = 0.32 for females and 3.14 for males.

If I read from your table 3: 79% of males was influenced by friends, and 55% of women. Odds ratio 3.14. Your statement is 'females were significantly more likely to report a decision influenced by friends, family or researchers.' How can this be? A LOWER percentage of females reported to be influenced by friends, how can is be significantly MORE LIKELY?

It indicates that the odds ratio's are in the wrong direction: from your table I should conclude that males are more likely to be influenced by friends. Although I understand the hypothesis that females are more influenced, the figures you present do not indicate that.

Another example is 'Helping others', you report that 4% of females were influenced by altruism and 27% of males were influenced by altruism. How can you conclude that 'females were also significantly more likely to report a decision influenced by general altruistic considerations? They are 23% LESS likely to report a decision influenced by general altruistic considerations.

**Minor:**

The explanation of figure 2 below it is still not very clear.

Please have a look the table again.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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