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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Reviewer’s Comments

The revision considerably improved the text. I have only minor remarks.

Response: We thank the reviewer for noting the improvements made and address their minor remarks point-by-point below.

1. End of the Background section, the 3 last sentences could be integrated to the Method section, second paragraph ("the study employed ").

Response: We have removed the last 3 sentences from the Background section, condensed them and incorporated them into the Methods section, second paragraph as suggested (Pg 6, line 24 – Pg 7, line 6).

2. Tables 2 et 3, the value of the r squared could be commented. The part explained by the model is relatively low.

Response: In consultation with the study statistician, we have added the following sentence to the Results section under Research Question 2 (Pg 16, Lines 2-4):

“Despite relatively low adjusted r2 values, indicating a weak overall relationship, the stepwise procedure still found multiple statistically significant predictors, so we can still draw our conclusions here.”

3. Page 24, line 21, the title "Training and protocols required" in bold.

Response: We have changed this heading to bold format (Pg 24, line 21).
4. Page 31, line 5, "with people" is duplicated. 
   Response: We have deleted the duplicated words (Pg 31, line 5).