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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

Many thanks for your responses and for making changes to your manuscript. I feel that the following changes to the paper would be helpful.

I am unfamiliar with the phrase 'introduced as extinction'. Does that mean that they were excluded? Please clarify.

In Table 1, family economic status is stated as 'Weak', 'Average', 'Good' or 'Very Good'. Were participants simply asked to select one of these phrases to describe their family economic status or were these categories derived from more detailed questions for participants? Please clarify this.

The following changes to Table 2 would be helpful: stating what the values above the bottom three rows represent; stating what the numbers 1-7 represent at the top of the table; and stating that factor loadings of less than 0.4 are not shown.

In the Abstract and in the Discussion (line 32), it states that the cognitive determinants and behaviour constructs explained 66.39% of the variance in the model. However, it would seem from Table 2 that the 7 factors explain 66.39% of variance and they simply have high loadings for the 7 constructs. Similarly, it states that the perceived severity, cues to action and perceived benefit explain most of the model variance ('Discussion', lines 4-6) whereas it seems that these constructs just load highly on the three factors which explain the most variance. Similarly, I think Figure 1 displays information relating to the factors rather than the constructs. I feel that this should be clarified.

There are currently many grammatical errors in the manuscript which affect the readability of sentences.
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