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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #2: The authors did an excellent job with the revision and have thoroughly addressed all major concerns raised by reviewers. I identified a few relatively minor issues that nonetheless need to be addressed before manuscript is accepted for publication.

Thank you to the Reviewer for the helpful comments.

1. Some of the study limitations are discussed in paragraph 3 of the discussion and then further limitations are presented at the end of the discussion section, just before the study conclusions. To minimise repetition and optimise flow, please merge all information on limitations into a single section and present all limitations in the one place.

We deleted the sentence “Such a cross sectional study is not without limitation as benefits attained cannot be directly attributed to the biostatistical courses and support” in the discussion to avoid repetition in the limitations section.

2. Abstract and methods (page 8): "rated on a Likert scale of 1- 4, where 4 was "excellent". Please add information on the label used to describe a rating of 1, for completeness.

The information has been added in the methods section

‘Likert scale of 1- 4, where 1 was “very bad” and 4 was “excellent” ’
2. Graduations and research units by publications section. Page 12, line 265, number of PhD graduation in 2017 is given as -64 (ie, negative number of PhD graduations). Please check this and correct as appropriate.

We corrected the number of PhD graduations in the text: (PhD: n= 64)

3. Still not defined what HSRO abbreviation actually stands for.

We added the abbreviation in the introduction: “Health Sciences Research Office (HSRO)”