Author’s response to reviews

Title: A qualitative study of the determinants of dieting and non-dieting approaches in overweight/obese Australian adults

Authors:

Stuart Leske (s.leske@qut.edu.au)
Esben Strodl (e.strodl@qut.edu.au)
Xiang-Yu Hou (x.hou@qut.edu.au)

Version: 3 Date: 6 December 2012

Author’s response to reviews: see over
28th November 2012

Editor-in-Chief
BMC Public Health

Dear editor,

Please find attached a revised copy of the manuscript entitled: *A qualitative study of the determinants of dieting and non-dieting approaches in overweight/obese Australian adults*, which the co-authors and I are resubmitting for consideration for publication in BMC Public Health as an original research article. The data reported in the present research were collected in accordance with the ethical standards set forth by Queensland University of Technology’s University Human Research Ethics Committee (UHREC). All authors have contributed to the paper in a meaningful way and have reviewed the final version of the paper.

We thank the reviewers for their efforts and comments and believe the revisions have significantly improved the paper. We have made extensive changes to the background literature and results section and have addressed all comments from the reviewers, with the exception of three discretionary revisions. We have also attempted to adhere to the RATS guidelines as closely as possible by including information in the manuscript to address these guidelines. We have provided a point-by-point response to the concerns of the reviewers in the pages that follow.

If you have any questions on this matter, please feel free to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Stuart Leske
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Editor’s requested changes:

1. Please provide the specific name of the ethics committee which granted approval for your manuscript.

Methods, data collection, first paragraph, first sentence: We have listed the specific name of the ethics committee which granted approval as per the editors’ request.

2. For reporting qualitative studies, please adhere to RATS guidelines.
RATS: http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/rats

We have attempted to adhere to the RATS guidelines as closely as possible although we have not stated this explicitly in the manuscript.

Reviewer 1’s report

Title: A qualitative study of the determinants of dieting and non-dieting approaches in overweight/obese Australian adults

Version: 1 Date: 16 September 2012

Reviewer: Gulcan Garip

Reviewer’s report:
The aim of this paper is to investigate the determinants of dieting and non-dieting approaches of overweight/obese Australian adults in order to inform health professionals' understanding of overweight and obese adults' decision-making processes. The paper is well structured and well written. The main contribution of this paper is that it sheds light on overweight/obese adults’ reasons for choosing non-dieting approaches, an area which has been under-researched relative to research into people’s decision-making processes for choosing to diet. The data collection is rigorous, and the interview guide is well suited for the purposes of this research. The model presented in Figure 1 is supported by the findings. Explanations of the derived determinants are clear and justified by illustrative quotes. The following revisions could strengthen the paper:
- Major Compulsory Revisions
None.

- Minor Essential Revisions
1. Background, paragraph 4: “…given that obese individuals prefer positive gain-framed…” apostrophe not needed.

   Apostrophe after individuals removed.

2. Methods, data collection, paragraph 1: “Emerging concepts were grounded in THE data…”

   “The” inserted.

3. Methods, data collection: Further explanations on the different types of sampling (purposive, theoretical) may be beneficial to readers; specifically, what were the main characteristics of the purposive sample, and what was the basis of the theoretical sampling? The authors later report (in the discussion section) that a convenience sample was used, which undermines the rigour of the aforementioned sampling techniques.

   **Methods, data collection, first paragraph, second sentence:** The main characteristics of the purposive sample (needed to be overweight or obese) are described here.

   **Methods, data collection, second paragraph; fourth, fifth and sixth sentences:** Three sentences have been inserted here (moved from “participants” section) to describe the basis of theoretical sampling as requested by the reviewer.

   “Convenience sampling and” replaced by “participant” in the discussion section (**ninth paragraph, second sentence**). The term convenience sampling was misused here.

   **Methods, participants, first paragraph, last sentence:** Description of theoretical sampling deleted as included in data collection section.

4. Methods, participants, paragraph 1: “Theoretical sampling led to one formerly…” this sentence was not very clear to me.

   This sentence has been reworded.

5. Methods, participants, paragraph 1, final sentence: “… rejected …” instead of “rejecting”.

   **Methods, data collection, second paragraph, sixth sentence:** “rejecting” changed to “rejected”.

6. Methods, data analysis: I would hesitate to use the term “causality” in relation to a qualitative analysis. Instead, rephrasing this sentence to read “… indicate the influences between each of the concepts…”.
Methods, data analysis, first paragraph, fourth sentence: The word “causality” removed and replaced by “the influences between each of the concepts”.

7. Results, first paragraph: Acknowledging the overlap between participants’ aim to lose weight whether they are dieters or non-dieters would be relevant as this is stated in the discussion later on.

Results, first paragraph, fourth sentence: Sentence inserted here to indicate that there was overlap between the aims of dieters and non-dieters.

8. Results, focus of approach, paragraph 1: “Adults who decided to diet primarily…” was this true of all participants? If not, stating whether ‘most’ or ‘some’ may be helpful to some readers.

Results, Focus of approach, first paragraph, third sentence: “Most” inserted at beginning of this sentence.

9. Results, focus of approach, paragraph 1: “… the primary outcomes expected and/or [reported?] by non-dieting adults…” Given that data were collected through interviews, it may be more appropriate to talk about what participants reported, instead of what they experienced.

Results, Focus of approach, first paragraph, fourth sentence: “experienced” has been replaced by “reported on” as per reviewer 1’s suggestion.

10. Results, personal autonomy, illustrative quote 2: “diet kitchen at university” – I am not sure what this means.

Results, Personal autonomy, fourth paragraph, first sentence: “diet kitchen at university” changed to “food preparation area used by nurses in training” as per reviewer 1’s suggestion.

11. Results, personal autonomy & self-efficacy with approach: The title chosen for these determinants overlap with theoretical constructs from the Self-Determination Theory and Social Cognitive Theory, however there is no discussion relating to either of these theories. I wonder if it would avoid confusion for some readers if alternative titles were chosen instead of the current titles, or perhaps including a section in the discussion to relate these determinants to the theories which they have been influenced from.

Discussion, fifth paragraph, seventh sentence: “Unfortunately” deleted at beginning of sentence. Two sentences also added at the end of this sentence to relate the personal autonomy construct to Self-Determination Theory and provide a definition of the construct as per reviewer 1’s suggestion.

Discussion, sixth paragraph: A sentence added at the end of this paragraph to relate the self-efficacy construct to Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory.

12. Results, perceived knowledge and self-efficacy with approach, illustrative
quote 2: Part of this quote has been presented in support of Focus of approach. Is it possible that the quote could have been coded for both themes?

**Results, Focus of approach, eleventh paragraph:** This quote was replaced by another one as per reviewer 1’s concern about its duplication later on in the article.

13. Results: The dichotomies presented for each determinant have been presented to suggest that dieters fall on one end of the continuum and non-dieters on the other, this is also emphasised in the discussion. The conclusion states that there may be some overlap. Is it possible that some participants may have fallen along the middle of these dichotomies? If so, the results section could benefit from incorporating a few examples of this.

**Results, Focus of approach, first paragraph, second sentence:** “along a continuum” inserted in between “ranged” and “from a focus” as per reviewer 1’s suggestion.

**Results, Focus of approach, fourth paragraph:** A quote of a person lying on the middle of this continuum (focus on weight/focus on health) inserted here.

**Results, Attitudes towards established diets, fifth paragraph:** An introduction and quote inserted here to provide an example of a participant lying in the middle of this continuum (dieter advocating for a non-dieting approach).

**Results, Time perspective, third paragraph:** A quote and introduction provided here to give an example of a participant who fell in the middle of this continuum (non-dieting approach happened overnight).

14. Discussion, paragraph 2: “A grounded theory STUDY of bloggers…”

**Discussion, second paragraph, sixth sentence:** “study” inserted between “grounded theory” and “of bloggers”.

15. Discussion, paragraph 3: Several statements in the discussion section go beyond what the data show. The sentences can be altered to present a more accurate discussion of the findings from this study. “… which MAY HAVE motivated SOME PARTICIPANTS’ attempts to persist…”, “… externalising dieting failure, which MAY HAVE LED others to question…”, “… misleading information, SOME obese adults MAY blame…”, “…which the authors note[d] MAY reinforce[s] a sense…”, “the sense of personal failure MAY reinforce[s]…”

**Discussion, third paragraph, first sentence:** “may have” and “some participants”” inserted.

**Discussion, third paragraph, second sentence:** “some” and “may” inserted.

**Discussion, third paragraph, fourth sentence:** “may” inserted.

**Discussion, third paragraph, fifth sentence:** “may” inserted.
Extra modifications to further rectify this:

**Discussion, eight paragraph, first sentence:** “preceded” replaced with “appeared to precede” near the end of this sentence.

**Discussion, eight paragraph, eighth sentence:** “some” added after “suggested that” to avoid generalisation.

**Discussion, eight paragraph, ninth sentence:** “can” replaced by “may” and “can” replaced by “and may”.

16. Discussion, paragraph 4, first sentence: “…established diets also APPEARED TO INFLUENCE whether… ”. This sentence may read better if it were written as two sentences.

**Discussion, fourth paragraph, first sentence:** “also predicted” replaced by “appeared to influence”. This sentence has been broken up into two sentences.

17. Discussion, paragraph 4, final sentence: Further explanation on what this community can provide support for, and for who (dieters, non-dieter, both?) could be useful to the reader.

**Discussion, fourth paragraph, seventh sentence:** This sentence extended to describe what the fat acceptance community can provide support for. Another sentence also added following this to provide an explanation of how this community could support both dieters and non-dieters.

18. Discussion, paragraph 5: “Obese adults HAVE REPORTED BEING introduced to…”, “Adults in this study [also] reported feeling accepted [and reported] when participating…”, “…a sense of hope and encouraging them to diet[s].” “…we found that SOME adults also engaged in…”, “…in the process OF conforming to moral…”

**Discussion, fifth paragraph, second sentence:** “have reported being” replaced “are”.

**Discussion, fifth paragraph, third sentence:** “also” and “and reported” deleted and “diets” changed to “diet”.

**Discussion, fifth paragraph, fourth sentence:** “some” inserted in between “that” and “adults” to avoid generalisation. “In the process conforming” removed and “based on the” inserted to add clarity to the sentence.

19. Discussion, paragraph 5: “…recent qualitative research suggests their experiences…” No reference has been provided in support of this statement.

**Discussion, fifth paragraph, fifth sentence:** A reference inserted at the end of this sentence.

20. Discussion, paragraph 5: FatOSphere – has not been written consistently
throughout the discussion section.

**Discussion, fifth paragraph, sixth sentence:** Thanks for picking this up. “FatOSphere” changed to “Fatosphere” in both instances.

21. Discussion, paragraph 6: “…while adults who were not confident in their ability to make their own…” A clearer explanation in support of this statement should be made in the results. As it stands, this statement is not well supported in the results section.

**Results, perceived knowledge and self-efficacy with approach, first paragraph, second sentence:** “seem to” inserted between “didn’t” and “feel”. “Rely on” and “that had previously worked for them” inserted into latter half of sentence. We have tried to make this sentence as clear as possible as per reviewer 1’s suggestion that it was not clear how this links in with the discussion sentence which reads: “…while adults who were not confident in their ability to make their own…” (see discussion, sixth paragraph, second sentence).

**Discussion, sixth paragraph, second sentence:** To use consistent terminology in the results and discussion on the above point, “diets” was changed to “dieting plans” at the end of this sentence.

22. Discussion, paragraph 8: “…’healthy’ person MAY HAVE preceded…”, “…adoption of a non-dieting approach in SOME overweight/obese adults.” “Other [previous] research studies have also suggested that SOME…”

**Discussion, eighth paragraph, fifth sentence:** “may have” inserted after (that of a healthy person) and “some” inserted after “non-dieting approach in”.

**Discussion, eighth paragraph, eighth sentence:** “previous” deleted and “some” inserted.

- Discretionary Revisions

23. Methods, Data collection: It may be interesting to discuss whether there were any differences between participants who were interviewed face-to-face and those who were interviewed over the phone.

**Methods, data collection:** We decided not to discuss whether there were any differences between participants who were interviewed face-to-face and those who were interviewed over the phone as there were no noticeable differences when interviewed.

24. Methods, participants: A table summarising participants’ characteristics, including how they were interviewed (telephone versus face-to-face), BMIs, whether they considered themselves a dieter or a non-dieter, etc. could be included.
Methods, participants: We decided not to include a table summarising participants’ characteristics, including how they were interviewed (telephone versus face-to-face), BMIs, whether they considered themselves a dieter or a non-dieter, etc.

25. Results, illustrative quotes: It may be useful to some readers to include participants’ BMI and whether they were a dieter or non-dieter (in addition to gender and age) to contextualise the quotes.

Results, illustrative quotes: We chose not to incorporate into quotes participants’ BMI and whether they were a dieter or non-dieter.

26. Discussion, paragraph 8: “…an identity that was protective and familiar.” Further discussion on the reasons for why the “old self” is protective may be of interest to some readers.

Discussion, eight paragraph, seventh sentence: This sentence inserted to further discuss the reasons why the old self is protective.

27. Discussion, paragraph 8: “…can grow stronger over time.” This statement is not supported by the findings presented in the results section.

Discussion, eight paragraph, ninth sentence: “…can grow stronger all the time” deleted at the end of this sentence.

28. Discussion, paragraph 9: It may be of interest to some readers if you referred users to existing systematic reviews that capture this growing body of literature (e.g. Brown & Gould, 2011 (already cited in paper); Garip & Yardley, 2011 – A synthesis of qualitative research on overweight and obese people’s views and experiences of weight management, Clinical Obesity).

Discussion, ninth paragraph, ninth sentence: This sentence inserted to refer readers to two recent qualitative syntheses describing weight management decisions as per reviewer 1’s suggestion.

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.

Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests.

Reviewer’s report 2
Title: A qualitative study of the determinants of dieting and non-dieting approaches in overweight/obese Australian adults
Version: 1 Date: 3 October 2012
Reviewer: Elizabeth Denney-Wilson
Reviewer’s report: Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript which was a pleasure to read. The paper reports on a qualitative study among (mostly) overweight and
obese individuals and uncovered unique insights into their attitudes and perceptions of a dieting and non-dieting paradigm. The findings are fascinating and will be of very wide interest to those working clinically and in the research community interested in prevention and management of weight gain. The methods and analysis are sound and any minor weaknesses in approach declared. The writing is clear and the paper flows very well. I did not detect any typographical or grammatical errors. I wish the authors the best of luck with their research.

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare I have no competing interests.

Reviewer #2 has no suggested changes for the manuscript.

**Reviewer's report 3**

**Title:** A qualitative study of the determinants of dieting and non-dieting approaches in overweight/obese Australian adults

**Version:** 1  **Date:** 19 October 2012

**Reviewer:** Samantha Thomas

**Reviewer's report:**
This is an interesting and well written paper which explores how a 'non-dieting' approach to obesity may be employed in improving health outcomes. It is refreshing to see researchers looking at these new approaches, and I commend the authors and particularly the PhD student on this study and the paper. I have some suggestions for improving this paper. The researchers have obviously collected rich qualitative data, and I hope the suggestions will help the researchers to strengthen this important piece of research, and to make the most of the narratives they have collected.

1. The background literature is somewhat brief, and reads more like a collection of statements. A more comprehensive background (with subheadings) would guide the reader through the complex range of perspectives/research associated with this area. Importantly this might seek to locate the literature within a public health or population health framework.

What have been some of the main arguments in including this within current approaches to obesity? There is some terrific research out there and would be well worth explaining to set the scene for your study. I think this is one of the key weaknesses of the paper - that there is limited discussion of the 'public health' application of the findings of this piece of research. Placing this within the background will allow you to link this back in with the discussion after your results.

**Background, second paragraph:** We have inserted this paragraph to briefly introduce the public and clinical health approach to treatment of overweight and obesity and preface the more extensive discussion below this as per the recommendations of reviewer 3.
**Background, third to eighth paragraph:** In accordance with the suggestions of reviewer 3, we expanded the background literature, created subheadings, and located literature situated within a public health/population health framework. These paragraphs (inclusive of the third and the eighth) have been significantly revised.

Just a minor point - your statement "Australia's obesity rates are among the highest in the world and have steadily risen during the past 30 years [2]" is not exactly true. Australia is one of the highest OECD countries. And rates of obesity (esp in kids) have plateaued according to some research.

**Background, first paragraph, second sentence:** We thank the reviewer for their clarification on Australia's obesity rates and have amended this sentence to indicate that Australia is one of the highest OECD countries. We have also updated the prevalence estimates of overweight/obesity in Australia in this sentence.

2. The methods are very well described. A minor point. You say you used a semi-structured interview? How does this fit within a Grounded Theory framework? I suspect what you may have done for this study is drawn upon Grounded Theory concepts, rather than used it in its 'purist' form. This isn't problematic, but you might just like to clarify that to ensure criticism of the methods used.

**Methods, data collection, third paragraph, second sentence:** We have replaced the term “semi-structured interview” with “guided discussion format” and a reference from Strauss & Corbin (1998) in response to reviewer 3’s concerns about using the semi-structured interview in a grounded theory study. This appears to be the terminology and methodology used by grounded theorists and the guided questions appear to be the same or similar to a semi-structured interview.

3. The results section need the most work. At the moment there are a lot of quotes but you could do a lot more to describe/interpret the narratives. There are a lot of ‘one line’ introductions to explain quite complex narratives, as well as generalisation (for example ‘Attributions about dieting failure also emerged as a category which differentiated between the choice to diet or not diet’) and I think these quotes deserve a much more detailed explanation in the text. It might be worth choosing a fewer number of quotes and fully explaining these, and linking them in with the appropriate theory (or alternatively explaining how these contribute to the theoretical model you are developing with your Grounded Theory approach).

The results section was revised in several places to reduce generalisation and describe/interpret the quotes in more detail. We linked two of these constructs in with the appropriate theory and attempted to explain how all of the constructs contribute to the theoretical model being developed in the **tenth paragraph of the discussion** (“decision to adopt a dieting or non-dieting approach might depend on several characteristics”).

**Results, first paragraph, third sentence:** “primarily” inserted between “approach” and “focused”.
Results, Focus of approach, first paragraph, first sentence: “for some adults” inserted at end of sentence.

Results, Focus of approach, second paragraph, second and third sentences: A more detailed introduction to the quote provided.

Results, Focus of approach, sixth paragraph: A more detailed introduction to the next quote [“it (dieting) certainly taught”] was provided.

Results, Focus of approach, eighth paragraph, second sentence: A sentence inserted here to provide a more detailed introduction to the quote [“I definitely like”].

Results, Focus of approach, tenth paragraph, second sentence: A sentence inserted here to provide a more detailed introduction to the quote [“I think focusing on”].

Results, Attributions about dieting failure, first paragraph, first sentence: “appeared to” inserted between “which” and “differentiate”. End of sentence also amended to “dieting and non-dieting approaches for some adults”.

Results, Attributions about dieting failure, first paragraph, second sentence: “some” inserted at beginning of sentence. A third sentence also inserted in this paragraph to introduce the quote in more detail.

Results, Attributions about dieting failure, third paragraph, first sentence: “sometimes” inserted between “failures were” and “attributed”. A second sentence also inserted in this paragraph to introduce the quote in more detail.

Results, Attributions about dieting failure, fifth paragraph, second sentence: “some” inserted at beginning of sentence. A third sentence also inserted in this paragraph to introduce the quote in more detail.

Results, Attitudes towards established diets, first paragraph, first sentence: “appeared to” inserted between “which” and “determine” and “for some adults” inserted at the end of the sentence.

Results, Attitudes towards established diets, third paragraph, first and second sentences: Both sentences rewritten to provide a more detailed introduction to the quote.

Results, Personal autonomy, first paragraph, second sentence: “some” inserted and “their decisions” changed to “this decision” at the end of the sentence. Sentences four and five were also inserted here to provide a more detailed introduction to the quote.

Results, Personal autonomy, third paragraph, first sentence: This sentence broken up into two sentences and extended to provide a more detailed introduction to the quote.
Results, Personal autonomy, fifth paragraph, first sentence: This sentence broken up into two sentences and extended to provide a more detailed introduction to the quote.

Results, Personal autonomy, seventh paragraph, first sentence: “in order to comply with” replaced “at”. A second sentence inserted to provide a more detailed introduction to the quote.

Results, Personal autonomy, ninth paragraph, first sentence: This sentence reworked in several places and a second sentence added to provide a more detailed introduction to the quote.

Results, Personal autonomy, eleventh paragraph, first sentence: “sometimes” inserted between “changes,” and “appeared”. A second sentence inserted to provide a more detailed introduction to the quote.

Results, Personal autonomy, thirteenth paragraph, first sentence: A sentence inserted here to provide a more detailed introduction to the quote. “Instead, a” inserted at the beginning of the next sentence.

Results, Perceived knowledge and self-efficacy with approach, third paragraph, first sentence: First sentence rewritten to introduce the quote in more detail. A second sentence added to achieve the same purposes.

Results, Time perspective, first paragraph, first sentence: “looked to” inserted between “also” and “contribute”. “some adults suggested” also replaced “diets were often chosen” at the beginning of the next sentence.

Results, Time perspective, first paragraph, third sentence: “were” replaced with “could be”, and this sentence also extended. The end of the fourth sentence after “maintenance” also deleted.

Results, Time perspective, fifth paragraph, first sentence: “appeared to be” replaced “were”, “were” and “by some adults” also inserted.

Results, Time perspective, fifth paragraph, second sentence: “was” replaced by “seemed to be”.

Results, Time perspective, fifth paragraph, third sentence: This sentence deleted and replaced by two sentences to introduce quote.

Results, Perceived identity, first paragraph, third sentence: “and the use of different labels” inserted at the end of this sentence. Fourth sentence inserted to introduce quote in more detail.

Results, Perceived identity, third paragraph: “If adults did lose weight” replaced by “for some dieters” at the beginning of the sentence. Two more sentences inserted here to introduce quote in more detail.
Results, Perceived identity, fifth paragraph: Two sentences here to introduce newly inserted quote illustrating participant making the transition in identity.

4. The discussion might then look at explaining the theory to emerge from your data, but also how this links into public and population health policy and practice - so what are the implications of your data for public health?

Discussion, tenth paragraph: This paragraph inserted to address reviewer 3’s suggestion that we should look at explaining the theory to emerge from the data and its implications for public and population health policy and practice.

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

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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

Declaration of competing interests: I have no competing interests to declare.

For the purposes of clarity, correcting mistakes and providing a more balanced perspective (by adding one more quote), we made several other revisions:

Background, first paragraph, third sentence: We have replaced “is associated with several health risks” with “increases the risk of” in the third sentence of this paragraph.

Background, first paragraph, third sentence: We have inserted the word “fortunately” at the beginning of the fourth sentence in this paragraph.

Background, ninth and last paragraph, fifth sentence: “theory” changed to “model”.

Methods, participants, first paragraph, fourth sentence: “six class I obese” changed to “five” as numbers in each category did not tally up to 21 participants (data reviewed to confirm this).

Methods, data analysis, first paragraph, sixth sentence: “Codes and” added at beginning of sentence.

Results, Attitudes towards established diets, first paragraph, second sentence: “the numerous diets on offer” inserted between “regardless of” and “contradictions in the industry”.

Results, Personal autonomy, second paragraph, first sentence: “weight watchers” capitalised.

Results, Time perspective, seventh paragraph: This new paragraph inserted to provide an example of negative perceptions about the long-term nature of “lifestyle change”, in an attempt to provide a more balanced perspective of this approach.
Results, **Perceived identity, first paragraph, second sentence:** ‘overweight’ person inserted among the identity descriptors.

Discussion, **fourth paragraph, second sentence:** “these attitudes” replaced “and” to create two sentences instead of the initial combined sentence. “With diets” also inserted after “persevering”.

Discussion, **fifth paragraph, third sentence:** “also” deleted and “and reported” deleted. “Diets” changed to “diet” at end of sentence.

Discussion, **eight paragraph, second sentence:** “an” inserted before “obsession”, which was also changed from “obsessiveness”.

Discussion, **ninth paragraph, second sentence:** “into the study” deleted, and “bias” changed to “biases”.

Author contributions, **third sentence:** “analysis of the data” inserted as a contribution of X-YH in accordance with triangulation between all authors (see top of pg. 11).