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Reviewer's report:

BMC Public Health currently considers the following article types: Database, Debate, Research, Software, Study protocol and Technical advance articles. We do not currently consider review articles.

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
7. Is the writing acceptable?

Please note I am happy with the revisions and feel that the authors have adequately addressed my concerns.

In reviewing the revised manuscript, please consider whether the authors have answered your points sufficiently well to allow their manuscript to be published. As before, we would like you to divide your comments into the following three categories:

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

I spotted some minor English language errors e.g. 1. Last sentence on the conclusion, intervention should be plural not needs 2. FG participants not participants to FG (p.7) and 'from' needs to be deleted last sentence p.12. There may well be others.

Given the very important role played by the translator/research assistant in both data generation and analysis (this is clearer in the revised manuscript) the authors might consider his/her inclusion as an author.
- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Once you have done this, there are also some questions for you to answer, including one that asks your advice on what the next step should be. Please bear in mind that it is the journal's policy to publish all work that is coherent and scientifically sound, providing that it is not too trivial to deserve publication at all at this stage.

BMC Public Health takes seriously issues of misconduct. Any manuscript or substantial parts of it submitted to the journal must not be under consideration by any other journal although it may have been deposited on a preprint server. The manuscript should not have already been published in any journal or other citable form, with that exception that the journal is willing to consider peer reviewing manuscripts that are translations of articles originally published in another language so long the consent of the journal in which the article was originally published has been obtained. Reviewers are asked to note whether they think duplication or plagiarism has occurred, or if they feel a piece of work is too small an advance on a previous article from the same group. Reviewers should also let the journal know if they believe that research has been falsified or manipulated, or if there are issues with the authorship or contributions towards the manuscript, such as the unacknowledged involvement of a medical writer.

REPORT TEMPLATE

For the questions below, please delete the options that do not apply.

Confidential comments to editors

Please use this only for comments that relate to ethical or policy issues. Do not use it to repeat all or part of the comments in your review for the authors. These comments will not be included in the report passed to the authors or posted on the site.

Reviewer's report

Please number your comments and divide them into

- Discretionary Revisions

These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to
ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.

Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the questions below constitute the report, bearing your name, that will be forwarded to the authors and published on the site if the article is accepted.

1. I spotted some minor English language errors e.g. 1. Last sentence on the conclusion, intervention should be plural not needs 2. FG participants not participants to FG (p.7) and 'from' needs to be deleted last sentence p.12. There may well be others.

2. Given the very important role played by the translator/research assistant in both data generation and analysis (this is clearer in the revised manuscript) the authors might consider his/her inclusion as an author.

What next?

----------

Based on your assessment of the validity of the manuscript, what do you advise should be the next step?
- Accept after discretionary revisions (which the authors can choose to ignore)

Level of interest

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

BMC Public Health has a policy of publishing all scientifically sound research whatever its level of interest. However if you choose one of the first three categories below, we may ask the authors if they would like the manuscript considered instead for the more selective journal BMC Medicine.

- An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English

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

As we do not charge for access to published research, we cannot undertake the costs of editing. If the language is a serious impediment to understanding, you should choose the first option below, and we will ask the authors to seek help. If the language is generally acceptable but has specific problems, some or all of which you have noted, choose the second option.

- Acceptable

Statistical review

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

- No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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We ask all peer reviewers of medical papers to declare their competing interests in relation to the paper they are reviewing. The peer reviewer declaration is included in the report bearing your name that will be sent to the authors, and published on our website if the article is accepted.

In the context of peer review, a competing interest exists when your interpretation of data or presentation of information may be influenced by your personal or financial relationship with other people or organizations. Reviewers should disclose any financial competing interests but also any non-financial competing interests that may cause them embarrassment were they to become public after the publication of the manuscript.

When completing your declaration, please consider the following questions:

- Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper, either now or in the future?
- Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper, either now or in the future?
- Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript? Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
- Do you have any other financial competing interests?
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If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests