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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have generally responded with changes that address the questions raised in my initial review of this manuscript. I have only a few minor additional comments that the authors may want to consider. I have used the same numbering system used by the authors in their response to the initial review.

2. Response Rate:
This still isn't quite clear. Am I correct in assuming that it was purely coincidental that 97 persons completed the pre-test and 97 persons completed the post-test, but the authors don't know whether the persons completing the post-test were the same as those completing the pre-test?

8. Ethical Challenges:
The change in the text is helpful, but it doesn't resolve the problem that participants were being asked to rank items of very different qualities. For example, if we asked people to tell us to rank: eating, food, and an orange in order of importance, how should we interpret the choice of ranking any one of these items over the other two?

11. Implementation of Workshops and Measures:
Although English is defined as the official language in Nigeria, my understanding is that for most people, including the likely participants in the workshop, it is not a first language. It may be that there are cultural and linguistic issues that would get in the way of understanding the questions asked or the answers given.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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