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Reviewer’s report:

The paper is acceptable for publication with a few exceptions:

The description of the statistical procedures remains still difficult to understand. The paragraph "dependent variables" of the methods section mentions a 4-point answer scale for both dimensions investigated in this study. However tables 2 and 3 list in their footnotes only three outcome levels that were analyzed. This difference should be clarified.

The results of model validation (proportional odds assumptions) should be given either in the methods or the results section. The reader remains otherwise unsure about the validity of the statistical analysis used in this study.

Perceived efficacy and perceived benefits are different entities (second paragraph of the discussion). I would refrain from using the term perceived efficacy.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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