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Reviewer's report:

General

This revised manuscript is generally responsive to the reviewers' comments, but there remain several minor comments to be adequately addressed.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

None.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

[1] (p.6) Specify how many existing questionnaires were found and used.
[2] (p.9) Data "were" analysed ....
[3] (p.11) The use of "Varimax" rotation remains unjustified.
[4] (p.12) Be specific about "Patient satisfaction is these two measures is assessed using two distinct concepts". What exactly are those two concepts and why they are expected to be different?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

[1] (p.6) Specify how many participants in each focus group.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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