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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
I can understand the three research questions raised and agree that they are all important and relevant. However, the wording for the second question may need to be improved, e.g. what do ‘they’ point to?

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The method of observation and questionnaire survey is appropriate. Some results appear to be generated from discussions with the clinicians, not just using the methods described. In such case, qualitative methods also need to be presented in the methods section. The description of the methods needs to be improved.

3. Are the data sound?
Although the sample size is small, for some analysis, such as Spearman correlation, some significant effects were detected, suggesting the sample size is reasonable. However, 9 responses is too small for reliable results to be acquired for Chronbach’s alpha test. This points to the question about the validity of the measurement for the research model posed in this particular study.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
The quality of reporting needs to be improved. See answers to Q3.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Some of the discussions appear to be based on data collected from discussion with clinicians, instead of data. However, the method was not presented. The discussion needs to be around the research questions, this logic connection needs to be explicit.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Could be improved.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Some refinement is beneficial.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
It could be benefited from further proof read and fine tuning. For example, use of headings for the presentation of results can improve its readability.

Minor Essential Revisions
Specific comments: p8 Line 4. The explanation about SN needs to add some more words to clarify the meaning adequately.
P.13 Questionnaire “As far as possible a standardized and previously validated questionnaire should be used”. Please provide support for this assertion.
P21. Para 1. Line 7. The explanation about insignificant relationship falls into subjective. The last sentence is not supported by the findings.
P22. The results presented in the first para. needs to be validated statistically, not just by the appears of slightly higher or lower in the diagram. Chi square test may help.
Para 2. Line 5, unclear sentence.
The discussion section may need to remind the reader about the research questions and how they are addressed. It is difficult to read given the information to be presented in the current version of the manuscript.
P24 Para. 2. The argument is not quite supported by the findings.
The sentences that are difficult to understand and can be benefited from re-phrasing.
P11 Para.2. The first sentence.
P12. Para 2. The accuracy of expression in the first sentence can be improved.
P17. The sentence in the first para.
P18. The sentence that follows Figure 2.
P19. The results presented appear to be generated from discussion with clinicians. If so, this source of information needs to be given in the methods section. Line 11, unclear sentence.
P20. The first sentence in Para. 2. When mean is under 4, the description ‘rather high’ is not accurate. ‘Rather high’ is a vague term, suggesting to avoid using it throughout the paper. It would improve accuracy to use the term in the actual instrument. The third line from bottom: mean = 2.57, this is a negative finding, say it so.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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