

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| TITLE (PROVISIONAL) | Risk Factors for the Prevalence of Poor Sleep Quality in Lecturers During COVID-19 Pandemic in Ethiopia: an institution-based cross-sectional study |
| AUTHORS | Hailu Tesfaye, Amensisa; Alemayehu, M; Abere, Giziew; Kabito, Gebisa |

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| REVIEWER | Tang , Kuok Ho Daniel The University of Arizona |
| REVIEW RETURNED | 25-Jul-2022 |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| GENERAL COMMENTS | <p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Line 26, page 3 – ‘cross-sectional study design was employed’ should be ‘cross-sectional study was conducted’.Line 34, page 3 – ‘is prevalence of poor sleep quality’ should be ‘is the prevalence of poor sleep quality’.Line 36, page 3 – ‘age ranges from’ should be ‘age of the respondents ranges from’ <p>Strength and limitations of this study</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">It is rather unconventional to start an article with strength and limitations of the study. The author may consider incorporating this into the discussion. <p>Background</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Line 68, page 4 – the author starts the sentence with ‘In contrast, poor SQ is....’ but it is uncertain what the author was drawing the contrast to. Was it good SQ? If yes, the criteria of good SQ should be described.Lines 72-73, page 4 – the author mentions that teachers of elementary and secondary school experience high risk of poor sleep but later emphasizes the need to study the sleep quality of academic staff in university. This appears contradictory. The need for this study should be clearly justified.Line 81, page 5 – the author may want to further explain why a shift from face-to-face teaching to online teaching impacts sleep quality.Line 97 – 100, page 5 – the sentence appears to be syntactically incorrect. Please revise the sentence accordingly. Besides, this paragraph seems to make up only of one sentence. It is suggested that the author merges it with other paragraphs. The author may want to pay attention to the multiple grammatical and syntactical errors throughout the text and perform a thorough proofreading.The background or introduction appears to be inadequately structured. The authors may want to properly organize the |
|-------------------------|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>contents as the problem statement seems to be scattered in the first and the last paragraphs.</p> <p>6. The author may wish to include a paragraph of literature review to highlight the existing relevant studies and the gap which this study aims to fill.</p> <p>Methods and materials</p> <p>1. This section has been further divided into multiple sub-sections e.g. study design and period, study setting and area, etc. which may not be necessary. It suffices that the author uses paragraphs to make a distinction of the contents.</p> <p>2. The sampling size was calculated based on the total population of lecturers in the University of Gondar, rather than that in Ethiopia. The author may wish to justify whether the samples taken entirely from the University of Gondar and the sample size are representative of the lecturers in Ethiopia.</p> <p>3. The operational definitions could be provided under definitions or glossary usually at the beginning of the article.</p> <p>4. The author may wish to explain on the selection of Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index as the instrument to measure SQ. Were other instruments considered?</p> <p>5. The author may wish to explain how the survey questions related to risk perception towards COVID-19 were derived and what theoretical framework was adapted to formulate the questions?</p> <p>Results</p> <p>1. Based on the demographics of the respondents, it seems that the sampling could introduce biases with certain groups of the population, e.g. male, those aged 30-39 etc. over-represented. It is worthwhile that the author explains how these factors are accounted for in the data analysis.</p> <p>2. It is of interest to know how the behavioral and psychosocial attributes were determined and what theoretical frameworks linked them to sleep quality.</p> <p>3. The author may wish to explain what sleep efficiency and sleep disturbance mean and how they were identified. The same goes to daytime dysfunction.</p> <p>4. The author mentions the prevalence of poor sleep quality in the title but no calculation or reporting of prevalence was observed in the results. The results merely show the scores of sleep quality.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>1. Conducting and preparing research is not an extracurricular task as it is related to teaching and learning. Having said that, most academics will have to render their services in teaching, research and administration.</p> <p>2. The author mentions about higher magnitude in the discussion but there is no indication of the magnitude of what. Is it the magnitude of the hazard? Risk is usually a combination of magnitude/ severity and likelihood. The author may explain how the risks and their magnitudes are determined in this study.</p> <p>3. Line 378, page 19 – there is a tendency in the discussion to mention that the findings align with other studies but there are no further details provided on the parts of the studies to which the findings are similar.</p> <p>4. There are obvious limitations related to cross-sectional surveys which the author may want to discuss.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>1. The author may wish to highlight the significance of the findings in this study.</p> <p>2. The author may consider providing more specific recommendations based on the findings of the study. In the current form, the recommendations are rather general.</p> <p>3. The author may suggest future directions of study.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| REVIEWER | Dwivedi , Deepti SGT Medical College, PHYSIOLOGY |
| REVIEW RETURNED | 06-Aug-2022 |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| GENERAL COMMENTS | The research methodology needs to be revised as few points in questionnaire are not clear. conclusion needs to be framed again being more focused towards the objectives of the study. |
|-------------------------|--|

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1

Responses to the reviewer 1 (**References correspond to *cleaned (revised) version manuscript***)

| Question/comment | Responses | Reference |
|--|---|--|
| Abstract | | |
| 1. Line 26, page 3 – ‘cross-sectional study design was employed should be ‘cross-sectional study was conducted. | Thank you so much for the thoughtful comments. The authors think the comment is absolute and corrected it accordingly | See cleaned manuscript, Abstract section, page 2 line 27 |
| 2. Line 34, page 3 – ‘is prevalence of poor sleep quality’ should be ‘is the prevalence of poor sleep quality’. | Thank you for the suggestions. We have now changed ‘is prevalence of poor sleep quality’ to is the prevalence of poor sleep quality, accordingly. | See cleaned manuscript, Abstract section, page 2 line 35 |
| 3. Line 36, page 3 – ‘age ranges from’ should be ‘age of the respondents ranges from’ | Thank you so much for the thoughtful comments. The authors think the comment is absolute and corrected it accordingly | See cleaned manuscript, Abstract section, page 2 line 37 |
| Strength and limitations of this study | | |
| 1. It is rather unconventional to start an article with strength and limitations of the study. The author may consider incorporating this into the discussion. | Thank you so much for your comments and suggestions. As per BMJ open format guideline strengths and limitations of the study were written under the abstract section. However now we revised and modified the section as per the editor’s comments and suggestions. | See the format of BMJ Open journal |

| Background | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>1. Line 68, page 4 – the author starts the sentence with ‘In contrast, poor SQ is....’ but it is uncertain what the author was drawing the contrast to. Was it good SQ? If yes, the criteria of good SQ should be described</p> | <p>Thank you so much for the thoughtful comments. The authors think the comment is absolute and we have now corrected the sentences accordingly.</p> | <p>See cleaned manuscript, background section, page 3 lines 68 to 79</p> |
| <p>2. Lines 72-73, page 4 – the author mentions that teachers of elementary and secondary school experience high risk of poor sleep but later emphasizes the need to study the sleep quality of academic staff in university. This appears contradictory. The need for this study should be clearly justified.</p> | <p>Thank you for your comments and suggestion. We have now modified and improved it as per your suggestion</p> | <p>See cleaned manuscript</p> |
| <p>3. Line 81, page 5 – the author may want to further explain why a shift from face-to-face teaching to online teaching impacts sleep quality.</p> | <p>Thank you much for the comments, we have now clearly explained how a shift from face-to-face teaching to online teaching impacts sleep quality</p> | <p>See cleaned manuscript, background section, page 4 lines 99 to 111</p> |
| <p>4. Line 97 – 100, page 5 – the sentence appears to be syntactically incorrect. Please revise the sentence accordingly. Besides, this paragraph seems to make up only of one sentence. It is suggested that the author merges it with other paragraphs. The author may want to pay attention to the multiple grammatical and syntactical errors throughout the text and</p> | <p>Thank you for the crucial comments and suggestions. We have now revised the sentence accordingly. Thus, we have merged it with other paragraphs as per your recommendation. We also modified the grammatical and syntactical errors throughout the text as per your comments.</p> | <p>See cleaned manuscript document, specifically lines 99 to 111</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| perform thorough proofreading. | | |
| 5. The background or introduction appears to be inadequately structured. The authors may want to properly organize the contents as the problem statement seems to be scattered in the first and the last paragraphs. | Thank you for the comments. We have now reorganized the background/introduction contents. We have also revised and reorganized the problem statement structure. Thank you again for your thoughtful comments | See cleaned manuscript document |
| 6. The author may wish to include a paragraph of literature review to highlight the existing relevant studies and the gap which this study aims to fill. | Thank you for your suggestions. We have included a paragraph that states of literature review. We have also included the gap which our study aims to fill | See the cleaned manuscript document, page 4 specifically lines 88 to 98 |
| Methods and Materials | | |
| 1. This section has been further divided into multiple sub-sections e.g. study design and period, study setting and area, etc. which may not be necessary. It suffices that the author uses paragraphs to make a distinction of the contents. | Thank you for the comment. We have made amendment on this section as per your recommendation | See cleaned manuscript document |
| 2. The sampling size was calculated based on the total population of lecturers in the University of Gondar, rather than that in Ethiopia. The author | Thanks for your suggestion. We justified that the sample size was calculated using single proportion formula and the required sample size was taken entirely from faculty members of the University of Gondar (College of | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| may wish to justify whether the samples were taken entirely from the University of Gondar and the sample size are representative of the lecturers in Ethiopia. | Medicine and Health Sciences, Comprehensive Specialized Referral Hospital (CMHS), Maraki, Atse Tewdros, Atse Fasil, and Teda campus) using simple random sampling techniques. Since this study was the first in its kind in assessing sleeping among lecturers in Ethiopia and the study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic in which all universities in Ethiopia announced to deliver their academic programs through online learning. Therefore, the author feels that all academic staff members in Ethiopia are almost equally exposed to poor sleep quality, due to the same working environment. | |
| 3. The operational definitions could be provided under definitions or glossary usually at the beginning of the article. | Thank you so much for each comment. we take your comments, however, revise the BMJ Open journal guideline We also now changed the operational definition to variable measurement and definition of terms | See the cleaned manuscript document, page 6 & 7 |
| 4. The author may wish to explain on the selection of Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index as the instrument to measure SQ. Were other instruments considered? | Thank you for the crucial comments - We have now clearly explained the selection reason for using the PSQI tool other than other instruments. | See the cleaned manuscript document, page 8 lines 202 to 218 |
| 5. The author may wish to explain how the survey questions related to risk perception towards COVID-19 were derived and what theoretical framework was adapted to formulate the questions? | Thank you so much for your interesting and thoughtful comments. We have now revised and reiterated what we did previously, we can also clearly clarify what we missed to include earlier in our main manuscript. We adapted the questions from the health belief model (HBM) theoretical framework, which included perceived susceptibility and perceived severity of COVID-19. | See the cleaned manuscript document, lines 223 to 235 |
| Results | | |
| 1. Based on the demographics of the | Thank you for your comments and concerns. Our study sample was | See the cleaned manuscript document |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>respondents, it seems that the sampling could introduce biases with certain groups of the population, e.g. male, those aged 30-39 etc. over-represented. It is worthwhile that the author explains how these factors are accounted for in the data analysis.</p> | <p>comprised of more (76.28 %) males than females and half (49.59%) of them were younger age groups (30-39 years old). This was due to the fact that, most University academic setting is dominated by males and the younger generation. . Studies done in Ethiopia (Meaza et al., 2020), Cameroon (Tami et al., 2021), and Saudi Arabia (Sirajudeen et al., 2018) had similar age and gender distribution, except for Malaysia (Karwan et al., 2015), and Iran (Madadzadeh et al., 2017) studies which had more females than males.</p> | |
| <p>2. It is of interest to know how the behavioral and psychosocial attributes were determined and what theoretical frameworks linked them to sleep quality.</p> | <p>Thank you for your important comments. We have explained how behavioral and psychosocial attributes were measured in the method section, specifically under the data collection tool and procedures. For behavioral we adapted the questions from the health belief model (HBM) theoretical framework and for psychological we used job characteristics Likert scale based model</p> | <p>See the cleaned manuscript document, lines 223 to 250</p> |
| <p>3. The author may wish to explain what sleep efficiency and sleep disturbance mean and how they were identified. The same goes to daytime dysfunction.</p> | <p>Thank you for your crucial comments, - we have explained what mean sleep efficiency, sleep disturbance, and daytime dysfunction under table 3 using the key (0= No difficulty, 1=Mild difficulty, 2=Moderate difficulty, 3=Sever difficulty). - Regarding their measurement issues (how they were identified); we have now included in the questionnaires (in supplementary file) how we measured each component of sleep quality in detail.</p> | <p>See the key under table 3</p> |
| <p>4. The author mentions the prevalence of poor sleep quality in the title but no calculation or reporting of prevalence was observed in the results. The results merely show the</p> | <p>Thank you for your comments. The prevalence of poor sleep quality was calculated from the seven components of the Pittsburgh sleeping quality index. All components were added and if the summation score of the</p> | <p>See the cleaned manuscript document, and the attached questionnaires</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>scores of sleep quality.</p> | <p>participants was greater than 5, poor sleep quality was ascertained. Participants' who scored 5 or less considered as good sleep quality or the participants have been not experiencing poor sleep quality. For more clarifications, as our measurement "Good sleep quality means equivalent with No poor sleep quality". We have now clearly stated the measurement methods of poor sleep quality in our method section and in our survey questionnaires. Moreover, previous studies addressing poor sleep quality were measured in the same way as we were.</p> | |
| <p>Discussion</p> | | |
| <p>1. Conducting and preparing research is not an extracurricular task as it is related to teaching and learning. Having said that, most academics will have to render their services in teaching, research and administration.</p> | <p>- Thank you for the comments. The authors think the comment is absolute and we have now modified and revise the sentence as per the suggestion.</p> | <p>See the cleaned manuscript document, the discussion section, lines 364 to 367</p> |
| <p>2. The author mentions about higher magnitude in the discussion but there is no indication of the magnitude of what. Is it the magnitude of the hazard? Risk is usually a combination of magnitude/ severity and likelihood. The author may explain how the risks and their magnitudes are determined in this study.</p> | <p>Thank you for your valuable comments. We have now modified and edited the sentences. Risk means the chance of developing poor sleep quality, while hazard means the potential to cause unwanted health effect. We showed in our study the magnitude of the risk of poor sleep quality.</p> | <p>See the cleaned manuscript document, the discussion section, line 383</p> |
| <p>3. Line 378, page 19 – there is a tendency in the discussion to mention that the findings align with other studies but there are no further details</p> | <p>Thank you for the comments.</p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| provided on the parts of the studies to which the findings are similar. | | |
| 4. There are obvious limitations related to cross-sectional surveys which the author may want to discuss. | Thank you for the comments. We have now discussed the limitation related to cross-sectional study design accordingly | See the cleaned manuscript document, line 60 and 61 |
| Conclusion | | |
| 1. The author may wish to highlight the significance of the findings in this study. | Thank you for the constructive comments. We have now modified it as per your recommendation | See the cleaned manuscript document, line 444 to 451 |
| 2. The author may consider providing more specific recommendations based on the findings of the study. In the current form, the recommendations are rather general. | Thank you for your thoughtful comments and suggestions. The authors think the comment is absolute. We have now made our recommendation more specific | |
| 3. The author may suggest future directions of study. | Thank you for your considerate recommendation. We have now suggested the future directions of study. | |

Reviewer 2

Responses to reviewer 2 (*References correspond to **cleaned (revised) version manuscript***)

| Question/comment | Responses |
|--|---|
| Methods and Materials | |
| 1. Those person diagnosed of sleep related disorder should also be exclude | Thank you for your thoughtful comments and suggestions. The au comment is absolute. We were excluded those person, while were write in our main manuscript. We have now modified the section a Thanks again for your considerate comments |
| 2. Kindly inform that questionnaire was free to use or not. | Thank you for your suggestion. We have now been informed that the questionnaire was free to use. |
| 3. The amount of alcohol intake is also an important point of concern | Thank you so much for your insightful comments. We did not mea the amount of alcohol intake. The authors acknowledge the comm |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>4. Duration of electronic device use needs to be define here</p> | <p>Thank you so much for your comments. We measure the variable the definition before. First, we ask them whether they were utilized going to bed then we asked them for how long they were utilized. included the duration of the electric device utilized in table 2. The significant association between the duration of electronic device use sleep quality, while as we stated before there was a significant as found between electronic device use/not before going to bed and quality. We also cited the concordant literature adapted from.</p> |
| <p>5. The marking or scaleing of this scale is not clear. So the grading of job satisfaction on the basis of scale need to be explain here itself</p> | <p>Thank you so much for your comments. All authors accept the cor have now modified and clearly explained how the variable was me</p> |
| <p>6. The marking or scaleing of this scale is not clear. So the grading of job stress on the basis of scale need to be explain here itself</p> | <p>Thank you for your important and interesting comments. We have and corrected it accordingly as per the comments</p> |
| <p>Results</p> | |
| <p>1. The basis of this division of salary with the sleep</p> | <p>Thank you for the comments. the division of the salary was based previous study conducted in the country or based on the study of <i>Musculoskeletal Pain Among Academic Staff of Mekelle Univ Ethiopia</i></p> |
| <p>2. The individual score data is not corresponding with global score</p> | <p>Thank you so much for your comments and suggestions. We were on Pittsburg sleep quality index scoring criteria. Also, we reviewed similar literature and we presented what we got from our study pa</p> |
| <p>3. As per above highlighted data in every individual score the maximum of the participants are falling in normal range or in good sleep then individual score is not corresponding with global score</p> | <p>Thank you for the comments. we have re-analyzed the data and v same things. As explained in the method section poor sleep quality calculated after calculating the seven individual components of sle quality. Then we added every seven components together and if a score was ≤ 5 then the individual was termed as not experiencing quality (good sleep quality) and if the individual score was > 5 we a poor sleep quality. Moreover, we have now attached the question used for assessment, you can see how we have done the calcula sleep quality since we added how each components were calcula in this attached questionnaires. Thank you so much again for you</p> |
| <p>6. The marking or scaleing of this scale is not clear. So the grading of job stress on the basis of scale need to be explain here itself</p> | <p>Thank you for your important and interesting comments. We have and corrected it accordingly as per the comments</p> |
| <p>Discussion</p> | |
| <p>1. The Reference study 8 and 65 have not given any information about socioeconomic status so this statement can not be made to explain difference in results of present study</p> | <p>Thank you so much for your comments. For instance, in reference <i>study population, 82.2% lived with family and 13.2% lived alone. W the participants had children, 45.4% did not. The question "Does y meet your expenses?" was responded to affirmatively by 50.8% o participants and negatively by 49.2%.</i> The authors think that all th variables were part of socioeconomic status. Moreover, to our bes review only we found those two studies which have a lower magn sleep quality compared to our study. Also, the previous studies we</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | in Turkey (8) and Malaysia (65), which had relatively improved so economic status compared to Ethiopia. |
| 2. The data for caffeinated drinks was not taken in the present study so this explanation can not the reason for sleep diaturbance in present study | Thank you so much for your very interesting comment, we have n from the revised manuscript accordingly |
| Conclusion | |
| 1. kindly be more specific and impactful about your conclusion | Thank you for your important and interesting comments. We have and corrected it accordingly as per the comments |

Thank you all for your very interesting and thoughtful comments and suggestions

1

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| REVIEWER | Tang , Kuok Ho Daniel The University of Arizona |
| REVIEW RETURNED | 04-Sep-2022 |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| GENERAL COMMENTS | <p>The paper has improved substantially from its previous version and is more ready for publication. Nonetheless, it still contains obvious grammatical errors as below and it would be good if the author could carefully proofread it during the galley proof stage.</p> <p>Line 53, page 3 – ‘objectively measuring’ should be ‘objectively measure’</p> <p>Line 106 – the phrase ‘the prevalence of sleep quality was found to be at a poor level’ lacks clarity. Does it mean poor sleep quality was more prevalent?</p> <p>Line 109 – ‘one in five sleep poorly’ should be ‘one in five sleeps poorly’.</p> <p>Line 134 – ‘the shift from face-to-face’ should be ‘to shift from face-to-face’.</p> <p>Line 135 – there is repetition of ‘use of’</p> <p>Lines 139 – 140 – the sentence appears awkward.</p> <p>Lines 219 – 220 – awkward sentence.</p> <p>Line 454 – the authors mention two investigations from two different places but the name of one of the places is missing.</p> <p>Line 484 – ‘long working hours reduces’ should be ‘long working hours reduce’.</p> |
|-------------------------|--|

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| REVIEWER | Dwivedi , Deepti SGT Medical College, PHYSIOLOGY |
| REVIEW RETURNED | 15-Sep-2022 |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| GENERAL COMMENTS | The study though not novel but well intended and need of the hour. The much needed modifications in the presentation of research have made it a fruitful research |
|-------------------------|---|

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1

Kuok Ho Daniel Tang, the University of Arizona

*Responses to the reviewer (References correspond to **cleaned (revised) version manuscript**)*

| Question/comment | Responses | Reference |
|--|--|--|
| 1. Line 53, page 3 – ‘objectively measuring’ should be ‘objectively measure’ | Thank you for your appreciated comments. We have now changed ‘objectively measuring’ to ‘objectively measure’, consequently. | See cleaned version manuscript, line 464, page 21 |
| Line 106 – the phrase ‘the prevalence of sleep quality was found to be at a poor level’ lacks clarity. Does it mean poor sleep quality was more prevalent? | Thank you so much for your fruitful comments. We have now modified and improved the sentence clarity as per your suggestion | See cleaned version manuscript, line 87, page 4 |
| 3. Line 109 – ‘one in five sleep poorly’ should be ‘one in five sleeps poorly’. | Thank you so much for the thoughtful comments. The authors think the comment is absolute and corrected it accordingly | See cleaned version manuscript, line 94, page 4 |
| 4. Line 134 – ‘the shift from face-to-face’ should be ‘to shift from face-to-face’. | Thank you for your important and interesting comments. We have now revised and corrected it accordingly as per the comments | See cleaned version manuscript, line 101, page 4 |
| 5. Line 135 – there is repetition of ‘use of’ | Thank you for your comments. We have removed it now | See lines 102, page 4 |
| 6. Lines 139 – 140 – the sentence appears awkward. | Thank you for the comments. We have now revised and improved the clarity of the sentence | See cleaned version manuscript, line 106 - 108, page 4 |
| 7. Lines 219 – 220 – awkward sentence. | Thank you for the comments. We have now revised the sentence | See lines 162 – 170, page 6 & 7 |
| 8. Line 454 – the authors mention two investigations from two different places but the name of one | Thank you for the suggestion. Both studies were conducted in Brazil. We have now modified the writing way the sentence | See cleaned version manuscript, line 372, page 18 |

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|---|
| of the places is missing. | | |
| 9. Line 484 – ‘long working hours reduces’ should be ‘long working hours reduce’. | Thank you for the comments | See cleaned version manuscript, line 402, page 19 |

Reviewer 2

Dr. Deepti Dwivedi, SGT Medical College, SGT University

*Responses to reviewer (**References** correspond to **cleaned (revised) version manuscript**)*

| Question/comment | Responses | Reference |
|--|--|--|
| 1. The study though not novel but well intended and need of the hour. The much needed modifications in the presentation of research have made it a fruitful research | Thank you so much for your comments. All authors accept the comments. In the last paragraph of the discussion section of the main text, we have now discussed in detail the methodological limitations of the study. All authors also revised the entire manuscript now. Thanks again for your considerate comments. | See the whole cleaned version manuscript document, above all the final paragraph of the discussion section |

Thank you all for your very interesting and thoughtful comments and suggestions

1