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Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary Revisions

Thank you for the opportunity to re-review this paper. While all of my comments have been dealt with, I still have some reservations about the way that the sampling frame is labelled. To describe the approach as ‘purposeful criterion sampling’ while at the same time, noting it as ‘convenience’ based to my mind is quite contradictory. Indeed I have briefly examined the reference provided which seems to suggest that a convenience sample is a separate approach. Given that the women were sourced from an existing study and not in an ‘ad hoc’ manner, I would not label the sample as convenience based, which implies a lower level of quality. Also I think it would be useful to explain exactly what criteria were used for the sampling and make an explicit comment in the discussion that saturation was not a specific goal of the sampling approach. My understanding is that saturation is not restricted to grounded theory approaches.
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