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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Stephen Madamba,

Thank you for your very valuable comments on the article. We are very grateful to you for taking the time to assess our manuscripts and for their positive and constructive comments.

Please find attached the revised version of the manuscript, and below a full covering letter, explaining the revisions made.

We hope that edited version meets the standards of the journal and we are looking forward to hearing from you.

Editor comments

While assessing your manuscript in-house, we found several instances where the text displayed similarities to text found in other previously published sources. While we understand that you may wish to express some of the same ideas contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work. We would therefore be grateful if you could reformulate the sections listed below to resolve the overlap between your
manuscript and other sources. Please ensure that, where relevant, these sources are also referenced as appropriate:

Background (pg. 3, lines 15-27)


Discussion (pg. 11, lines 25-36; “Given that our findings supported…”)


We reformulated the selected fragments as suggested by the Editor.

In accordance with our submission guidelines, please include the initials and individual contributions of all authors in the Authors’ contributions section of the Declarations.

The initials and individual contributions of all authors has been included in the Authors’ contributions section of the Declarations.

Please remove the response to reviewers from the file inventory, as it is no longer needed at this stage of the editorial process.

The response to reviewers was removed from the file inventory.

At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colors. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

The revised manuscript is a single clean copy without any tracked changes, colored or highlighted text.
Reviewer reports:

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 3)

I think that the author adequately addressed the reviewers comments.

The idea seems interesting and I did not find evidence lacking in best practice.

In my opinion the manuscript is sufficiently interesting and could be published on a scientific journal.

On the other side, the level of journal that could accept this kind of contribution would be not very high (trying to quantify a journal on Q3-Q4 of ISI Thompson ranking).

Thank you very much for the positive opinion about our article, as well as valuable attention about the level of the journal that could publish our article.

Design is lacking (under my point of view) because it is based only on some questionnaire data (few). On the other hand I understand that these kind of applied studies cannot be done on more outcomes in order to avoid data loss.

Thank you very much for your valuable attention. The study design has been supplemented with new information and more detailed as suggested by the reviewer.

We hope that applied the amendments will enable the publication of the manuscript in your journal.

Yours sincerely,

Mateusz Cybulski