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Reviewer's report:

General

I agree with the revisions made; but note that not necessarily only a 5-point scale would perform better; in general it would be recommended to use 5-or-more-point response scales, certainly if parametric statistical testing is envisaged. Note that this would even debatable in some disciplines and journals.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

None

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

None

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

None

What next?: Accept without revision

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.