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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract:

The setting is not missing any more. However, it needs to be mentioned in the methods section, rather than in the background (line 27).

Methods (line 31): The introduction of the word ‘preliminarily’ is misplaced here. If you conducted a pilot study with your newly developed questionnaire, it is a pilot study. In this case, issues of questionnaire design, validity, etc. need to be addressed. If this was not a pilot study, limitations of the questionnaire need to be addressed. The word ‘preliminarily’ acknowledges none of those options, but implies that the questionnaire was not ready to be used. The same applies to line 114 / page 7.

Discussion:

Table 2:

In the first review I stated the following:

“In question 1 there is the abbreviation ‘CVS’. In question 3 the reader finds ‘chorionic villus sampling’. It would be preferable to have the same in both questions. If CVS is not explained before, the full statement is superior to ‘CVS’.”

It is nice that the authors responded to this with stating CVS in full in the table now. However, if the table shows the original questions from the questionnaire, it is not acceptable to change the questions after the questionnaire has been applied. The concern is more the imperfect design of the questionnaire and specifically the lack of checking it for (face) validity, applicability, and properly piloting it.

Please present the questionnaire / the questions exactly as they were asked in the study.
In the first review, it was stated:

“In Table 2, question 4, the reader finds actually two questions in one. This is against the classical construction of questionnaires, and not very helpful. It raises questions with regard to questionnaire development, checking by experts for face validity, and piloting it. Such a mistake is acceptable as you call your work a ‘preliminary study’ (line 242). However, in case of a preliminary study, such problems need to be addressed. Moreover, the study needs to be labelled as a preliminary study e.g. in the abstract and the methods. Limitations need to be discussed with regard to the developed questionnaire as well.”

Unfortunately, the above explained limitations were addressed for this specific issue, but not for the entire questionnaire. It still needs to be acknowledged that the lack of piloting the questionnaire and a check by experts for (face) validity is a clear limitation of the study. Please note again that not the questions were preliminary, but the study.

Major compulsory revisions

Please make clear whether this is a preliminary study (and if yes, why do you think so), or whether this is a survey with an imperfect questionnaire.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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