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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a technically sound contribution?

Yes - current version is technically sound

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:
GENERAL COMMENTS: This is a very thorough and well described study. While its findings are not extraordinary, it is a competent and well written paper.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

The literature review is thorough but lean, and presents a cogent rationale for asking the research question.

The Methods section is similarly thorough. I do have a pet peeve around the presentation of results in the Methods section. Specifically, that there were 167 invited, but only 159 gave their consent is a RESULT of your protocol, and not the protocol itself. Those numbers should be reported in the Results section.

The description of the questionnaire is appreciated, but overly detailed. Much of this is better left in an Appendix. This is especially true of the many Y/N questions. That information is best communicated in a table.

The Ethics portion is appreciated, but all that is needed is that the study received Ethics permission. We don't need to know more details than that.

The Results section is quite detailed. Table 3 does not require a p-value AND a 95% CI. Choose one.

In general, finding ways to make the Results section more concise would be appreciated.

I find the Discussion and Conclusion to be well expressed and cogent.

I found this manuscript to be cogent and thorough.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.
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