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Reviewer's report:

General
The manuscript by Edwards et al. has improved since the last review and the authors have carefully implemented most of the revisions.
Again I would like to stress the importance of a detailed method section since this is the key element for capturing the validity of any work. Since the questionnaire had not been validated statistically I am happy that a pilot testing had been done before the &
I am surprised that the authors did not incorporate this before since these facts are essential and have to be included for assessing quality.

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

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
The difference between the version of the pilot test and the actual questionnaire should be included in the method section.
It would have been nice to see how many transplantations in total are performed at the Bristol affiliated centers the students attended.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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