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Reviewer's report:

General
The authors have made some improvements. However some of the suggestions they did not consider or in an inadequate way.

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

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

Point 1 of our suggestions: repeated splitting of the sample in two subsamples with multiple comparisons causes a significant higher alpha error.
Their answer: significant level of alpha set to 0.001
Our answer: This choice is arbitrary and is not explained.

Point 2 of our suggestions: The 47 characteristics of YHP should be analyzed by factorial analysis to reduce the amount of data.
Their answer: The number of participants is too small.
Our answer: The number of participants is more than 2000. This number is more than sufficient to conduct factorial analysis.

Point 3 of our suggestions: Instead of multiple group comparisons the authors should conduct a three group comparison (one-way ANOVA): students with high preference to YHP, with low preference to YHP and actually working YHPs.
Their answer: They did not answer to the suggestions and did not conduct the three group comparison.

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

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?: Reject because scientifically unsound

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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