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Reviewer's report:

General

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined? 
Yes, it is quite clear what the authors set out to do.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work? 
The methodology is clear, but the sample realization is not clear. It is stated that the sample was “calculated as prescribed”, with a reference. This is not clear enough. The specific approach to calculating the sample needs to be given.

From the description it would seem that 55 people were sampled, and received questionnaires, and all of them completed them. This does not sound credible. How many questionnaires were sent out? How many were returned? What % sample realization does that give? How many then participated in the test-retest part of the survey? When it comes to the factor analysis it is just stated that the sample was “adequate”. How many respondents was in this adequate sample? The numbers of the samples need to be much more explicitly stated.

With regard to the ethics, there is reference only to obtaining permission to do the research, but how the permission of the respondents were obtained, is not described. I assume that willingness to complete and return the questionnaire was seen as informed consent, but this issue needs to be addressed in the article.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled? 
The results are clearly reported, and the analysis seems appropriate.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? 
Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes, the discussion and recommendations does not give major insights, but rounds off the article.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? 
Yes.

7. Is the writing acceptable? 
Yes.

Minor compulsory corrections: 
The clarification of the sample sizes.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes
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