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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions

Comment 2; page 2
Under Abstract
Methods: design and methods not consistent with the conventional ways of qualitative research.
Authors should clarify how this approach was to produce the desired results for this study.

Comment 3; page 2
Under Abstract
Data collection methods too restrictive in form of a questionnaire. How did the authors ensure exhaustive inquire to assess factors influencing belief?

Comment 4; page 2
Under Abstract
Results: not focused on factors influencing belief. There is no clear result to answer the main aim of the study. Authors respond how this fits with answering the research question.

Comment 1; page 2
Under Abstract
Conclusion: it is not concluding on the research findings. It is instead providing a recommendation.
Authors must provided a conclusion from the results.

Comment 5
Introduction: page 3
The authors provide literature focusing on the knowledge and practice on fever and fever management rather than the factors that influence the beliefs on fever and fever management. The introduction therefore requires to be refocused so that the readers can understand the rationale of the study.
The study design used by the authors is not the conventional for qualitative research. Can the authors clarify how they expected this approach to provide valid results for this work?

Methods:

Sample size: the authors are studying a population beyond Neblus, can they explain why they limited their sample size estimation to Neblus population? The assumed response rate of 50% was to what factor. The authors should clarify. In the reference provided, this response refers to a particular question posed. the authors should clarify what this rate refers to. the authors are doing a qualitative rather than quantitative research therefore a qualitative approach for sample size should have been employed. Can they justify why this approach was adopted?

Ethical approval: the authors should justify why verbal consent was used instead of written consent.

Data collection form:
The variables in the data collection form cannot answer the question this research seeks to answer. Can authors explain how they intended to answer the research questions using the variable information they were collecting.

Data collection procedures:
Can the authors explain why the focus group discussions were conducted among the researchers rather the study participants?

Can the authors assure that the change of the data collection form by the principal researchers did not affect the homogeneity of the data collected?

Statistical analysis
Can the authors revisit the statistical analysis to reflect how the study measures were to be analyzed and reported to meet the objectives.

Results:
This whole section is providing quantitative results and there is no result for the
factors influencing the beliefs and practices in fever except for some information on anti-pyretic use.

Comment 13; page 10 - 12
Discussion:
As noted in the first sentience this study was focusing on the beliefs and practices in fever management rather than factors influencing the beliefs and practices.
The discussion is therefore focusing on results that do not answer the question of this work.

Comment 14; page 12 -13
Conclusions and recommendations:
These are not in tandem with the research objectives of this research. They must be revised.

Minor essential revisions

Discretionary revisions
The authors may revisit the title to make it consistent with the paper content

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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