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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)

I think the authors have made some very good changes to the paper. Nevertheless the authors havent addressed the issue of the numbers of apprentices at the school. Table 1 identifies 286 apprentices and the accompanying note says this is the number who COMPLETED the questionnnaire. In methods the authors say that all apprentices were asked - so how many were asked?

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

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

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

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: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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