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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for letting me review the revised version of the manuscript. A few of my original comments have been answered satisfactorily. However, I do still have multiple concerns about the authors' responses:

1) Please provide a more detailed description about the assessment of reliability. Stating that Cronbach's alpha was used is inadequate and doesn't provide insight into the actual methodologic approach. Was a test-retest methodology used? If so, please describe. Did the authors assess inter-rater reliability? If so, was inter-rater reliability assessed by HCP subtype? A more detailed description of the approach is warranted.

2) I am unfortunately still unable to to open or see Appendix 1.

3) The authors state that concerns about normality, data distribution, and sample size precluded an inferential approach with ANOVA and they proceeded to conduct pairwise t-tests instead. Like ANOVA, inferential testing with a two-sample t-test necessarily assumes that the data is normally distributed and that the variances of the two populations are equal (please see https://ncss-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/themes/ncss/pdf/Procedures/NCSS/Two-Sample_T-Test.pdf). As such, given the aforementioned concerns about the data, this is an inappropriate test to use in this instance.

4) Thank you for the clarification and the addition of the table footnotes. What were some of the reasons for substantial variability in non-responses to the various survey items?

5) Thank you for the response.

6) Thank you for the response.

7) Thank you for the response. What statistical test(s) were used to conduct these tests of independence?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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