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Reviewer’s report:

I appreciate that you took the effort to rework this paper. It is much clearer and easier to understand the research process you undertook to do the time motion study. It was good that you put in some of the findings so that the reader can understand the general findings for this important study. Thank you very much for you efforts. Several general comments below:

p. 5 please rework the sentence from line 17 to 20 to make the findings parallel e.g. there is a deficit of 7.8% female and 65.2 percent male workers....

On page 7 study participants I would include the number in each group instead of putting it in the findings. Page 9 line 13 I think you want to use referenced and not referred reports. page 10 line 14 I think you want iterative process and not reiterative. On page 11 with the categories and sub-categories by job roles I think it might be more interesting to put this in a table and not in the text. It would show the links between the categories and sub-categories more clearly in a table. p 13 line 14 spell out synchronized instead of synched. page 15 on the results for the working day, what was the expectation on the number of hours they should have worked per day according to their JD or contract. It was hard to know if there should or should not have been a difference in the number of hours actually worked each day.
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