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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is clearer than previously. However, I do not think that my comments were satisfactorily addressed. The manuscript is written as a quality article and not as a research article.

Usually a research paper states the research question at the end of the introduction section and does not state before describing methods and results that they will helpful for others: "The positive outcome of our efforts allows taking these practical suggestions as blueprint for similar projects."

For me it is still not clear why part of the results (i.e., the first part of analysis) of the complete analysis are described in the method section. The method section should indicate only the methods (i.e., design of the study, setting and population involved, intervention, data collection, analysis). The result section should describe the results of the first analysis and the /

The discussion section is now too long and repeat without need the background. In the first part of this section, the main results should be summarized and the originality of the study overlined. Then the main results should discussed and confronted to other publications. Some limits of the study should be discussed and then the conclusion could then open perspectives on utilisation by others.

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.