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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is improved with these revisions and should be published.

A few minor corrections to be made:

P 4 line 43: writhing should be writing

P 5 line 45-46: more causes should be multiple causes or reasons

P 6 line 20-23: check the grammar

P 6 line 32-33: The authors use the term "Chinese walls". This is unclear. Is it a phrase commonly used in Denmark? Consider simply stating what is meant for a broader audience.

P 8 line 8: forums should be fora (not forums) unless the journal indicates otherwise. The singular is forum and plural in Latin is fora. There are a number of places in the text where this change needs to be made (p 8 line 56, p 9 lines 8-10).

P 10 line 49: Check whether "tabooed" is an accurate term.

P 17 line 6-7 contributes not contribute

P 17 line 11: incomplete sentence (it's not clear why the e.g. is included)

P 17 line 30: By some physicians should be According to some physicians…

P 18 line 12: preunderstanding should be preconceptions or assumptions

The final paragraph on page 18 lines 23-32 is unclear. What point are the authors making? Clarify.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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