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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? YES
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? YES
3. Are the data sound? YES
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? YES
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? YES
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? YES
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? YES
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? YES
9. Is the writing acceptable? YES- with a few minor revisions.

- Minor Essential Revisions

1. Please spell out the word respondents (rather than using resp.)
2. Please indent the first line of each new paragraph.
3. On page 17, please revise/clarify the two sentences just after note [33] beginning with “Therefore.” These 2 sentences seemed a bit incoherent, perhaps as if a few words had been omitted.
4. On page 19, fifth line from the bottom of the page, it isn’t clear to me what is
mean by “low own responsibilities.” Please clarify.

5. Please correct the sentence fragment on page 22, fifth line from the bottom of the page that begins “Though further investigation. . . .”

- Discretionary Revisions

1. It would be helpful to have a little more information on page 9 regarding how the authors evaluated the pre-test items and what it means that they were “adjusted accordingly.”
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