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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed all my comments and suggestions in a satisfactory way, thank you. For me this paper is acceptable for publication.

Just a few reactions to the response to reviewers:

- comment 11: I meant considering both years and questioning methods in the same paper, not in the same analysis. The fact that the results point in the same general direction provides some extra reliability of generated insights, as eg sensitivity analyses would provide. It was just my suggestion to reflect on it in the strengths & limitations.

- comment 12: Again, some misunderstanding about my point; it's not directed at merging the years together. I just meant here that you might have considered reporting the difficulty question with the bare results instead of dichotomizing, so as to better judge congruence with 2015 results (yes, even with two different methods and analyses)

- comment 18: I would add this information in the paper.

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

Yes

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?
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