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**Reviewer’s report:**

Minor Essential Revisions

The authors have taken seriously all comments what the reviewers have pointed out. They have also done good job the prepare their manuscript.

May I kindly point out some minor points, which may help the authors to focus their paper.

In Discussion part (page 16) - what is the meaning of the second paragraph: "First of all..."? Is the topic of the paragraph implications for the practice? If yes, it should be moved at the end of the paragraph.

In generally, the first part of the Discussion section should include a comparison of the results with exiting literature. For example, are the results similar or different comparing to previous results? If they are different, why?

All recommendations ("organisations should....") could be combine and present at the end of the paper (implication). By doing this the implications of the study are more concrete and clearly identified.

"Conclusions: The study provides useful insights...." Is this sentence in line with the aim of the paper - or it is wider comparing to an original goal of the paper?
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