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Reviewer's report:

Although I regret that the revised manuscript still does not explain the specific potentials of Q methodology in the context of the authors’ research question, I do not object publishing the manuscript neither ask for substantial further revisions. Two or three of the seeming contradictions within accounts mentioned in my first review are still not convincingly resolved. But this failure may be attributable to the restrictive field conditions which prevented post-sort interviewing, as reported by the authors.

I spotted one mistake: In Figure 3 the factor scores for statement 36 (col. +2) should be ‘4 1 2 4 3’ not ‘-3 -2 -5 1 2’.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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