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Reviewer’s report:

This paper is clearly written. The abstract outlines the nature of the study. The introduction in the main paper provides the background and rationale for this study. Justification of the tools used to measure the variables is evident.

The results section provides the reader with a position on the reliability of the scales (which appears to be good), and the correlation between variables.

The study would be strengthened by the following:

(1) comparison of the cronbach alphas with the scales already published for these scales

(2) further clarification or support for the inclusion of Figure 1. Although the figure is clear it needs to more fully embedded in the paper or deleted.

(3) inclusion of the relevant correlation data into the discussion to support case.

There are some stylistic considerations that should be changed.

Page 5: Line 20 - will improve his performance. The term his should be changed to their performance. A similar example occurs on line 18 of the same page. Please check for other usage of the gender specific term and change.

Page 6 - line 11. "It is comparable to the one given by [9] ". The [9] should be changed to the authors or the focus of this reference.

The definitions of perceived behavioral control through to behavioral intention (pp 5 and 6) may be better place in a table.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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