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Reviewer's report:

General

Previous reviews of this paper pointed towards a potential 'discussion' paper of interest but one which could not be considered as a research paper due to weaknesses with the data. Unfortunately, while I feel the second half of the paper now provides interesting issues for debate, I am still concerned with the continued reliance on the problematic survey data.

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

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

I believe only further revision with far less reference to the survey is the only way an reasonable 'discussion' paper can be produced.

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

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)

What next?: Reject because too small an advance to publish

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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