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Reviewer's report:

General

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

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

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

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

Nice job!

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

This is very well written and interesting paper, and it is rare that I have so little comments and suggestions for improvement. There is however one methods aspect I would like to authors to expand on:

There is very little information about the depth and breath of the material that was analyzed: How many messages were submitted in the different focus groups? What was the frequency and distribution of messages among focus group participants? Did every member respond to each topic? Did every member participate daily in the focus group?

This is very important information - after all, the conclusions that can be drawn from this study greatly depends on this material.

Nice job!

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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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