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Dear Editor,

On behalf of all the co-authors, I would like to thank you and the reviewers for the additional information. All your constructive comments were closely followed and an extensive linguistic editing was performed. We have revised our article and it is a pleasure for us providing you our point by point response to their comments.

I hope to find it worthwhile and consider it for publication in your Journal.

Yours sincerely,

Eirini Oikonomidou

Reviewer Aanand Naik:

1) Please accept all track changes and then highlight any edits with italics or underline function. The tables are not readable with track changes.
2) Please have a native English speaker read and edit the manuscript.

Response: We have highlighted any edits with italics. We have also extensively edited the manuscript with the assistance of a native English speaker.

Minor essential revisions:

a) “Remove the quantitative comment in the methods section of the abstract and remove the quantitative statistical analysis described in the methods. This is a qualitative paper (not even a mixed methods paper) and you should leave out the quantitative elements except in perhaps your demographics paper. But comparisons here are strictly for descriptive purposes.”

Response: Thank you for the comment. We removed all the quantitative data from the manuscript.

b) “The transitions in the introduction need to be better linked. The authors have been responsive to the reviewers but the transitions between paragraphs are difficult to follow”

Response: Thank you for your comment. We have tried to ameliorate the transitions in the introduction section.
Reviewer: Anna Gagliardi

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

1) Comment: Participants
"all interviews were included within the study for the establishment of solid conclusions" - not clear what this means

"patients were evaluated using a Greek translation..." patient <what> was evaluated - clinical characteristics, demographic attributes...?

Response: Thank you for both comments. We have decided to exclude the first sentence for reasons of clarity. However, we believe that it would be interesting to clarify that we haven’t performed any sample size estimation. We decided to take into account the interviews of all the participants in order to obtain all the available data.

We have also rephrased the second sentence “ patients were evaluated using a Greek...”. The new sentence is edited with italics (paragraph 2 of the Methods- participants section)

2) Comment: Interview development
"The TPB guided the construction of <an> interview <guide which was> approved by...”

"the TPB diagram is clearly illustrated in the <add name/word rather than link?”

Response: We have rephrased the part of the TPB theory for the interview development. It is also marked with italics (paragraph of the Methods-interview development section). Also, we have replaced the relative link with a reference concerning the TPB.

3) Comment: Analysis of data
“although the authors elaborated on their qualitative methods, further detail about how the qualitative analysis was undertaken would be helpful, particularly to naive readers.”

Response: Following the reviewer’s suggestion we have added some explanatory sentences about the procedure undertaken. All changes are illustrated in italics.

also, the sentence about multivariate regression analysis needs some explanation - what data was this analysis used for - to distinguish these methods from the qualitative methods
Response: Thank you again for your comment. Taking into consideration the comments of both reviewers about quantitative data we decided to delete the above sentence. We retain in the results section the table about socio-demographics of the participants and the remark about male gender in the discussion section.

"qualitative content analysis was performed since the data that have been drawn from the interviews were consisted from free responses to the open ended questions of our survey" - not clear what this means

Response:
We would like to thank you for your comment. We simplified the whole paragraph adding some explanatory sentences about the procedure undertaken. (All changes are marked with italics)