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Reviewer's report:

The writing is very clear and I enjoyed reading this article. I have made a few suggestions for possible corrections/amendments that the authors may wish to consider to further improve the clarity of the article:

Line 78 – include reference after ‘setting’
Line 90 – what does ‘[page 4,2]’ mean?
Line 165 to 166 – because a ‘variety of techniques…’ consider including what other techniques are used apart from constant comparison
Line 202 – change ‘respondents’ to ‘parents’
Line 209 – include ‘parent’ 802
Line 212 – include ‘parent 806
Lines 225 to 227 – is not clear to me what you mean
Line 267 – remove ‘etc’
Line 307 – include ‘etc’ 811
Line 312 – the reasons behind it ‘appears to’ being….
Line 439 – certainly ‘the’ presence…
Line 505 – R1 not R
Line 522 – where ‘the’ qualitative
Line 550 – in ‘an attempt to’ avoid….
Lines 554 to 556 - is not clear to me what you mean
Lines 586 to 587 – I agree but does this statement need a reference or explanation?
Lines 600 to 602 –this is a long sentence
Line 614 – the ability ‘of XXX’ to aid…
Line 653 – reference needed

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests