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Reviewer's report:

No major compulsory or minor essential revisions warranted. A discretionary revision suggestion which I suspect the authors have previously considered but decided against is to make explicit the implication of their research, which is merely implied in table 4 and hinted at in the discussion section. Namely, the "conditional" acceptance of AR by majorities of HCW which this study documents is a consequence of HCW ignorance about the methods quality, translational relevance to humans, and predictive value for humans of AR. The disconnect between HCW expectations about the quality of AR and its relevance to human health versus the reality reflected in the published empirical evidence is near-total. The logical conclusion is that if HCW were aware that their "conditional" support for AR was based on mistaken assumptions about its quality and human relevance they would rethink their endorsement of AR, and withdraw it. The authors, perhaps wisely, seem hesitant to appear to insult their intended audience by baldly stating that if HCW were better informed about the realities of AR they would withdraw their "conditional" support for it.
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