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Reviewer's report:

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

I think I understood the results in Table 3 - were these predicted means based on the regression analysis (regressed on age, facility, and degree)? If so, then standardized mean differences can’t be calculated. Reporting the r-squared values from the regression analysis may be appropriate in the text. Standardized mean differences (effect size d) can provide the readers with a practical index of the potential effect of the intervention.

- Accept after discretionary revisions (which the authors can choose to ignore)

Level of interest

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

- An article of importance in its field. This article lays the groundwork for the follow-up proposed by the authors. I hope that they will complete additional research and submit the results for publication.

Quality of written English

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

Acceptable - generally acceptable. Some sections of the background - first paragraph in particular were hard to read.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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