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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to look at the revised version of the manuscript and the response. The research is interesting should be a useful addition to the literature. I note that the authors have produced thorough and detailed responses to all comments, which is nice to see. However, there are still some minor issues with the presentation and reporting that I felt were not adequately addressed.

1. There are still issues with the presentation and the quality of the writing. For example, on Page 5 under Research Instrument "administrated" should be "administered" and "includes" should be "included". However, these are mostly minor and while they are wrong it is still reasonably clear what was meant in each case.

2. Rather than reporting the p-values exactly, the authors have replaced the use of "p<0.05" with statistical significance in some places and reported p-values exactly elsewhere. Given that there are multiple comparisons, these should all have been corrected for multiple comparisons and I would argue that this is an even more important reason to report the exact p-values (as well as raw differences/values) wherever a statement about significance is used. The exact values are reported correctly in the tables so this did not make sense to me.

3. The clear difference between the intervention and the control at baseline should be discussed clearly in the manuscript and explained. Without an explanation it casts doubt on the validity of the study.

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?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.


Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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