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Reviewer’s report:

The majority of comments have been addressed satisfactorily. There are only one or two minor things outstanding; the authors can be trusted to make these revisions without further peer review.

Minor Essential Revisions

(1) The references are still not written consistently. For example:
Ref 8: the year needs moved in line with all other refs.
Ref 5: the year, volume and pages are in italics, and shouldn’t be.
Some refs (such as 10, 11, 16, 17, 19, 21, 30) have the year then a comma; other refs have year then a colon.

(2) Page with table: this states Table 1 and title at the top, but then also Fig 1 at the bottom of the page. However, this is probably just related to how it has been uploaded and won't be present in the actual publication.

Discretionary Revisions:

(1) In the Results section, when discussing response rate, add the word 'groups' after 4.

(2) Ref 15: I think 'National Student Survey' should also be mentioned within the reference - this title appears when you click on the link. Also, perhaps change the way the date is written to avoid any confusion (maybe include the word July).

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.
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