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**Reviewer’s report:**

Thank you to the authors for a quick turn around and thorough reply to all the comments of reviewers, even the discretionary comments. Again, the manuscript is clear and reads well. Changes made are useful and improve the quality of the manuscript by providing more detail (e.g. additional files) or clearer presentation (e.g. Tables).

- **Major Compulsory Revisions**
  1. none

- **Minor Essential Revisions**
  2. Results, Paragraph 1 and Table 1; to be complete in reporting outcomes of all four questionnaires used, it might be an idea to also report the rate and percentage (x/79 and x.xx%) of people that have endorsed the Roland item.

- **Discretionary Revisions**
  3. Background, Paragraph 3, line 4: by adding “are” in “... sleep quality and ARE commonly used ...” the sentence might flow a little better.
  4. Background, Paragraph 4, line 7: Please place “of” in between “...evaluation of the capacity OF these questionnaires...”.
  5. Methods, paragraph “Roland item”, line 5: this sentence might read more easily if “to” from “to answer” is removed, reading “easy to understand and answer by...”

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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