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Reviewer’s report:

This paper is a very raw draft. In this stage of development it cannot be recommended for publication, not even evaluated thoroughly. Many sentences don’t make sense and were not understandable to me. The subtitles need to be checked (for instance on p. 4 there is "Discussion / Approach / Empirical ethics-research/Subject area of the paper". This does not make sense. It is unclear how the tables are generated. Your own methodology remains in the dark. Table 1 is identical with Table 3 - why?? How can "criteria" be translated into questions, as given in the complicated tables? What do you mean by each of the items? Etc.

Before resubmitting the paper it needs to be much more clearly re-written and also professionally English-revised.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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