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Reviewer’s report:

I would include a table that described the various models you present in paragraph two (Light, Beresford, Farnan, Han). It would help the reader stay oriented to the various buckets you use to discuss the topic.

Always use a), b), c) or don’t...but lines 81-83 introduce that formatting when it wasn’t used prior to that.

You didn’t define "useless" data in line 131. Please explain.

Line 138 should be effective OR ineffective not effective of ineffective.

Lines 181-185 are unclear. What are you trying to say?

Line 201 should be respond TO the questionnaire.

Line 248 also seems to include a typo..."more the case"

Can you provide more information about how Beresford's model was extended by Farnan? It seems to be an issue of context. Could you at least highlight that?

In line 316 you discuss each component but really provide a review of the topic. The paragraph that follows is confusing.

Line 388 would be better to read "type of uncertainty"

Gender differences in Table 1 seem significant. No p values are included.

Figure 1 needs some annotation so the ready knows what you are highlighting....why is this figure important?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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