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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor,

Thank you for the last round of comments.

This is a brief response that includes what we have done to address your final concerns, as well as respond formally to some of these. I first would like, on behalf of all authors, to thank you for your time and effort in improving our manuscript for publication.

We have addressed comments 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and the first part of comment 7 directly in the manuscript.

Concerning your comment #1, this part of the Introduction was added in light of previous concerns highlighted through the peer review process. In addition to this, all authors now feel like keeping this part of the Introduction will help to support the reader in understanding the findings of the manuscript. While it is true that we already explain this in the discussion, giving this information earlier on in the paper should help the reader keep in mind the scope of the findings while reading the manuscript. We however reframed the sentence to now say: “should be easily transferable to other disciplines.” instead of “are easily transferable to other disciplines.”

Concerning the second part of comment 7, we agree that only a small part of the respondents mentioned fear of retaliation as a problem. We have not removed this sentence from the manuscript however but edited it to reflect this. We have edited the sentence to indicate that only some participants said this, so used extra hedging vocabulary with “might”.

Concerning your concern about the data, you are right that some comments are not reflected in the data if not classified by at least two authors. However, this way of analyzing qualitative feedback is often used and we feel like, since we have provided all raw data, this is not problematic at all. It is possible that some comments were not coded by some of the coders, but such is inherent to this kind of analysis. We however added to the methodology section the following sentence: “Consequently, some comments therefore were not counted, if they were not coded by more than one author.”

Kind regards,