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Author’s response to reviews:

Editor Comments:
Thank you for your response to our revision requests. However, there are a few final editorial requests we would like you to address before we accept the manuscript, detailed below.

1. Ethics approval
Thank you for stating "Further approval to conduct the study was obtained from the administrative body of the healthcare centres, where data collection was conducted."

Please include the full name of the administrative bodies (and the institute to which it belongs to) that approved the study and the committee’s reference number if appropriate.

Response:

We have refrained from listing the administrative bodies by name, as the clinics actually requested to remain anonymous. This is partly to do with the sensitive nature of their work and the fear of any unforeseen consequences and in other parts with a general culture of preserving the anonymity of healthcare facilities in publications. Therefore I hope that this is understandable to the editor.

2. List of Abbreviations
Please provide a list of all the abbreviations used in the manuscript. This list should be placed in a section "List of Abbreviations" just before the Declarations section. All abbreviations should still be defined in the text at first use.
Response:

In the last assistant editor’s comment from Megan Barling, I was asked to remove the table of abbreviation and just list and explain abbreviations in the text. Therefore, I removed the original table from the manuscript. I have now added it again and hope that this is satisfactory to you.

3. Additional files
We currently note that all of the additional files are missing. Please ensure all files are attached with your revised submission.

Response:

Thank you for making us aware of this. It was a mistake I made in the submission process of this manuscript. In fact, when the question comes on the system to tick the documents that should be part of this revision, I misunderstood and ticked only the marked manuscript, as this had been revised and needed replacement by the, now clean, modified copy. I thought the additional files would remain automatically, as they required no revision. I will be more careful this next time.

4. Clean manuscript
At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Additional files should remain uploaded as separate files. Please ensure that all figures, tables and additional/supplementary files are cited within the text.

Response:
Thank you for making us aware of this. The only copy of the manuscript submitted is now the clean version with the latest modifications included in this letter.