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Reviewer’s report:

The authors did a thorough job of addressing the reviewers’ comments. This is an interesting study and the additional details provided in the authors’ response to the reviewers helps to illuminate the high quality of this research. I would like to point out that I appreciated the authors’ use of the term “data management” when referring to the qualitative analysis software used, as I believe that it is important to make the distinction, in qualitative research, that the researcher is the one making the analytical decisions, as opposed to analysis being conducted by the software itself.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

None.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. Background, para. 2: Please explain what the “millennium development program” is for readers who may be unfamiliar with it.

2. Background, para. 2: Please rephrase “Women are the breeders of healthy individuals …” as the terms “breeders” has a negative connotation when referring to women (i.e., the implication that a woman’s purpose is to breed children).

3. Methods, Participant Selection and Data Collection, para. 3: “about 20-120 minutes” The term “about” suggests an average, which this is not. It appears that you are referring to a range (the shortest being 20 minutes and the longest being 120 minutes). Please clarify by either replacing “20-120” with the mean interview length or changing this sentence to: “Interviews ranged from 20 to 120 minutes in length.”

4. Methods, Participant Selection and Data Collection, para. 3: “which are able to better clarify the individuals’ understanding and experiences.” It is unclear what the basis of comparison is here. Better than what?

5. Methods, Participant Selection and Data Collection, para. 3: “like all qualitative studies” – This is an overgeneralization. Qualitative studies do not by necessity take place in natural environments. This phrase should be deleted.

6. Discussion, para. 3, first sentence: I was confused by this sentence. It sounds as though you are saying that the results are similar except for stress
management, but then go on to list other ways in which the results differ. This should be reworded for clarity.

Discretionary Revisions:

1. Methods, Participant Selection and Data Collection, para. 2: The parenthetical statement “(the highest and lowest 10%)” seems unnecessary.

2. Methods, Data Analysis: “The outcomes of the participants’ verbal communications, which were recorded on tapes, as well as their nonverbal communications, were written down.” This sentence was confusing and should be rephrased.

3. Stress Management, para. 1, sentence 1: You have defined “stress management” by using the term “stress management.” Considering using alternate terminology the second time that it is used in this sentence.

4. Feeling Improvement in Emotional and Psychological Health: Consider splitting the first sentence into two separate sentences, for example: “Another main category derived from the analysis of the data was feeling improvement in emotional and psychological health. Participants felt an improvement in the emotional and psychological dimensions of their health, as well as physical and functional dimensions, when they were engaged in health-promoting behaviours.”

5. Discussion, para. 2, sentence 3: I suggest changing “conducted on” to “conducted with”.

Minor Issues Not for Publication:

There remain numerous typographical and grammatical errors throughout; these are highlighted, along with suggested corrections, within an annotated copy of the manuscript (attached).

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

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

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