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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors have revised their work very well. The quality of the paper has improved by mentioning more details. Sometimes, they bring up too much detail. An example. The authors now sum up a lot of information about the Morocco total population. This is a lot of characteristics. Please select the most relevant characteristics and delete the other characteristics.

I miss an answer to a question: “I miss the connection with the originally EQS-H questionnaire in the discussion. Are there differences between the results of the original questionnaire and the translated questionnaire?” In the method section you give more information about the reliability of scales in the French questionnaire (alpha 0.92-0.95). But I miss the connection between the two questionnaires. You can put this in the discussion. For example, you can say that the scales are comparable or have the same reliability. Then you can make an overall conclusion that the questionnaire that facilitates cross-cultural research. You can now mention this in the introduction. You can repeat this in the discussion.
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