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Reviewer's report:

A word of thanks to the authors who in their response letter have clearly responded to the concerns and questions raised. The majority of questions is well answered, both in the letter and in the revised paper.

The largest question that still remains is whether the forecast of 30-40% students leaving is indeed a good estimate. The authors have indicated how they came to this figure, namely by multiplying the share of people who wish to leave by their (average?) likelihood of leaving. Based on the numbers provided elsewhere in the paper, this would amount to 0.621*0.5=0.31. One could debate if this calculation can be interpreted as such, but it is good that the authors have now added this explanation. It is up to readers to decide whether they want to follow the authors in this. Adding a reflection on this calculation (or reference even) would benefit the argumentation, but I leave that choice to the authors. If my calculation is correct, then a details is also that I would expect the confidence interval to vary around this 31%, so e.g. 26-36% instead of 30-40%. The authors can either recheck their numbers or rephrase that section, which is the largest minor essential revision.

Another minor essential point is that in the first paragraph of results I don’t understand how many 5th and 6th year students are part of the sample (and population): the authors mention that 37 incomplete surveys represent 46.5% of all 5-6th year students, which would imply their total group size to be 80. But the following sentence says that all 100% of study participants (47.5+52.5) are 5th and 6th year students. Either the sentences need to be rephrased to avoid confusion or the percentages mentioned are incorrect.

Two discretionary revisions are as follows:
- the added text in the final section of the discussion (‘However, the probability..’) is difficult to understand if one didn’t read the reviewer’s remark. I would therefore advice to rephrase the start of that section such that it is clearer to the reader, e.g. by adding a sentence and avoiding the word ‘however’ as start.
- the first results section mentions a response rate of 100% and high representativeness of the sample. If it is indeed 100% then the sample would even be fully representative. As the sample was drawn after leaving classes it also suggests that not a single student has skipped a class (e.g. due to sickness). I cannot check whether this is true, but I trust the difference to be minor and negligible.
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