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Reviewer’s report:

General
The authors have adequately addressed all my problems, except one. In addressing one of the problems, they have created a new problem.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
Old problem: The statement that the sample size was calculated according to the literature has not been changed. My problem with this is that most sample size calculations require certain assumptions to be made. In stating it like this, the reader does not know what the assumptions were, not do the authors indicate what the results of the calculation was (what sample size was required?).

The authors state that the respondents were given assurance of anonymity, but then they contacted 10 of them five weeks later. How would they know who to contact if the data was anonymous? I think the term they should use is confidential, and that they should make sure that anonymity is guaranteed only in terms of the report, and not in terms of the actual data.

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