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Reviewer's report:

I found this a well-written thoughtful paper that outlined the problem well, outlined the decisions around choices of methodology, presented the results well and acknowledged the limitations. The conclusions were well justified. The two main limitations are the low response rate and the problem with self-reporting.

I have some relatively minor queries/suggestions

1. The term 'predictors' is used. I understand this can be common parlance in statistical modelling but in reality, the researchers have found 'associations'. Predictors can be misconstrued as implying causation.

2. The response rate should appear in the abstract

3. I was curious to know if there might be any differences by university but my guess is the numbers may be too small to determine this - plus there would likely be some political sensitivities around this. I wonder if some acknowledgement on this might be worthwhile? That is, why the decision was taken not to compare the different courses? For example, it is possible the association with attachment lengths might be confounded by the type of programme. I don't feel strongly about this point

4. The description of the demographics section and how this related to census data was not clear to me (p6 lines 16-20). I'm guessing what may have happened is that the questions asking about demographics may have been worded in the same way as they are worded in a census? If that is the case, then that should be stated more clearly. I'd also like to know which demographic questions this referred to. I found it even harder to understand how the 'published work on cultural responsiveness' related to the census data collection. I presume this sentence needs some re-wording as it seems to conflate different ideas.

5. In view of the low response rate, it would be reassuring to have some indication of how representative the respondents were compared with non-respondents. One way to do this would be to look at the demographic breakdown of the denominator populations (the universities will...
have this information) and compare that with the respondents. It won't provide complete reassurance, but knowing if there was a gender or age imbalance or a cultural background imbalance would be pertinent to interpret the results.

6. In table 2 the "p<.05" is indicated by asterisks but it is not clear what was compared with what. For example, there is an asterisk under CAS for 1st year and 2nd year but not 3rd year or 4th year. So one assumes 1st year was different from something - was it different from year 2, 3 or 4 or all of those? Or maybe it implies that 1st year was different from 2nd year? This needs to be clarified. Each table really needs to be understandable on its own without undue reference to the text or to other tables/figures.

7. In table 3 there are figures indicated by 2 asterisks but the footer only provides information on data with one asterisk. I presume this is a simple typographical error?

8. I'm not sure we need figures 1-3 as well as table 2
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