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**Reviewer's report:**

1. This provides a somewhat mechanistic discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of 'respondent validation', which is reflected in the emphasis on accuracy and provision of corrections (Barbour, 2001). The idea of targeted interactions is a useful one, but the authors overlook the potential for using pro-formas to record information that is routinely required.

2. A more interesting observation relates to the ethical implications. However, this is rather glossed over, with discussion concentrating on respondents' potential discomfort at 'poor grammar'. Particularrly where the research topic relates to sensitive or upsetting issues, the impact on the respondent of reading a transcript should be a central concern for the researcher.

3. Although the potential for removing or adding statements is mentioned, the focus on the individual respondent means that the authors lose sight of the dataset as an entity.

4. A comment at the end of the article does address the issue of analysis of the whole dataset, and the authors acknowledge the limitations of 'ITR' with regard to research where the aim is to capture interviewees' experiences, and where "contradictions and factual misinformation may provide the researchers with significant insights".

5. The argument presented in this paper hinges over much on the specific research project discussed and would have benefited from locating this within the wider arena, including a consideration of the role of 'ITR' within an overtly action research orientation.

6. The argument presented is not new (see Bloor, 1997) and does not really advance the debate about respondent validation. This is because discussion fails to
engage with the existing literature, as the authors have been somewhat selective with regard to the sources they have used. Several key papers are not cited, including Bloor (1997) and Frosh & Emerson (2005).
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