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Reviewer's report:

General

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

In order to understand the implications of this research, the authors need to provide more details about the conference at which these interviews were conducted. They need to provide several specific examples of the types of presentations that they describe, and offer comments as to why some of them worked better than others. What message are we to take away from this paper?

They also need to provide a few more details about the statistical methods and how the multivariate analyses were carried out.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

The tables seem pretty cluttered with all of the non-significant results in them. I would suggest just including those results that were statistically significant and saying in a footnote that the others were not statistically significant.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory 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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