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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is generally well written and well done.

Comments:

Major points:
1. For the conclusions in the abstract as well as in the manuscript, the authors did not mention about the implications from the results of the study. It seems to me, I thought that the authors just mentioned something about the advantages of the Q methodology (quantitative and qualitative combination). What’s next for implications?
2. For Q methodology in data analysis section, you did not describe how to return the statements (factor arrays) into the Q-sort (score sheet) for each pattern.

Minor points:
1. There are no labels for the figures of the Q-sort Model or the patterns of health seeking behaviors and viewpoints toward the study subject. Figure 1..., Figure 2..., Figure 3... and Figure 4.....
2. I am a bit confuse when you have used the phrase “health seeking behavior”, but in some places you have written as “health seeking strategies” (in the conclusion part of the abstract). Are those two phrases having the same meaning or substitution?
3. In the background, paragraph II, the word “medicals assistants”
4. The perception toward primary health services is the perception toward the quality of primary care services, right?
5. In data analysis, for the factor loading values that were significantly loaded more than one factor and the loading values were not much different, what did you do for such the cases? Do you have any criteria for determining?
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