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Reviewer's report:

I have read the revised version of this paper, and am satisfied that the authors have addressed the substantive changes that were required. The paper is significantly improved. There are a few minor requested changes that I would recommend prior to publication:

p.4 The comment about procedural issues (‘including using business models’) is a little unclear — does the literature suggest that using business models helps or hinders recruitment? Could the authors rephrase, please.

p.7 The authors mention early in the paper that the findings are ‘theoretically generalised’ but do not explain what this means until the conclusion. Either clarify on p.7 what is meant, or leave this argument till after the findings have been presented.

p.10-11 Ensure that all uses of data are followed by a plural verb (‘were’ rather than ‘was’). There are also a number of typographical errors still remaining in the paper. e.g. p. 16 ‘staffs’ should be ‘staff’.

Conclusion: while this is now much more convincing than the previous version, I still do not think that it is doing the paper justice. e.g. Paragraph 2 starts ‘In some respects, the findings substantiate those of previous research … ’, but then is not explicit about whether there are other respects in which it does not. Also it is hard for the reader really to pull out the new findings that the paper has uncovered — these get a little lost in the detail within the specific paragraphs.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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