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Reviewer’s report:

The paper contributes to a small but growing literature on consumer “self-testing.” The research reported here uses an existing Internet panel in the Netherlands to provide an assessment of the prevalence of self-testing and the correlates of such practices.

Major compulsory revisions:

To fully evaluate the research, it would be useful to have more information about the research methods. In particular, could you provide a bit more information about your questionnaire, including:

1. How the questionnaire was developed (e.g., based on a review of related questionnaires; with or without piloting with a relevant sample?), how many items it included, how it measured item response (dichotomies, scales?), and how many times the questionnaire was circulated (only once, without follow-up?)

2. Your sampling frame and specifically, the Internet panel (who are its respondents, how are they recruited, how is their representativeness assured?). The material on the flycatcher website is not in English, so your readers are unlikely to learn much by perusing it. Finally, could you also provide an analysis of how your respondents compared to your non-respondents – on as many items as possible – and discuss what this might indicate about your results.
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