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I have now read through the revised paper and confirm that I am happy with the majority of revisions made. There are still one or two points that I feel need clarifying:

Revision point 9: I think the authors should explain in the paper that the list of 12 treatments was based on lists from previous studies in the rehabilitation setting as they state in their response

Points 10/11: again I think the authors should state the explanation given in their response in the paper i.e. that selective comparisons were made a) in order to compare with previous work and b) for reasons of confidentiality

Point 12: results page 1, paragraph 3 'more than'

Point 13: results page 2, paragraph 4; page 3, paragraph 1, both numbers and percentage need to be included here

These points can be easily addressed and I would then be happy to recommend publication.
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