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Review 2 (Christiana Nöstlinger)

In what is to follow, I refer to my previous review and will provide answers assessing in how far the points raised were taken care of.

1) Research question

Page 3: The purpose of the paper is now presented in a more focused way in the introduction. However, I would still propose to make the objectives more visible by adding one sentence like: ‘the aim of this study was to explore explanatory models of hypertension held by… 3 (at the end of the paragraph on background…’

I would suggest to use another term (e.g. ‘demographic context’) rather than ‘the People’ as heading for the next section...

2) Method section

The method section has clearly improved, but the confusion between methodological approach and data collection technique is still inherent in the text. A statement on the underlying methodology is clearly missing (ethnographic study, grounded theory approach, etc.). As the authors did not comment on this remark, it seems obvious that no decision for one specific methodological approach was taken when designing the study, so the authors may want to start out by saying something like for instance ‘this study is based on a qualitative inductive approach using data collected through both in-depth interviews and FGD…”

The rationale given for the use of the two different data collection techniques is sufficiently explanatory, but unfortunately in the text no further use is made of the two different types of data sources. (# see also remarks on results).

Page 5: refer to table 2 and talk about composition of FGD

The authors should talk about “saturation of data” rather than “redundancy”;

The authors address purposive sampling for FGDs; this needs some more explanation, not just a catchword…
The fact that the author/researcher moderated the discussion could be seen as a limitation to the study (introducing a bias when steering the discussion in a specific direction, even without intention or not on purpose …)

Page 6: Structure this part of the method section according to in-depth interviews and FGDs as this will result in better readability. 
Mention if topic guides were pre-tested or piloted. 
Mention clearly on which type of data or health behavior model the development of the topic guides was based on. 

A lot of new information was added to the method section, which provides necessary background information about how the study was done. However, this new text could be structured a bit more. I propose to have subheadings, like study participants, study instruments, procedures…etc. 

Coding and analysis: 
Describe clearly the role of the independent research (# page 7: ‘another anthropologist’): were the coding made by two independent researchers or was it just some kind of feedback? 

Limitations of the study: I suggest to put this whole section towards the end, before the discussion section. Add the potential bias that may results from the fact that the researcher was also the moderator…

3) Results 
As indicated under “methods”, the added value of the different types of data used is lost. It would be interesting to learn more about which type of data yielded which type of results, as indicated in the method section. 

Indicate gender and age in a consistent manner when quoting a study participant. 

# Page 8:
Explain abbreviation BP. 
Use the term “quotes” instead of “verbatim” 

Figures: the figures have been simplified nd provide a much better visualization of the complex data. 

4) Conclusions 
This section would improve if the authors were to focus on what this study adds to what already is known in the relevant field of research; they cite a lot of other studies undertaken, and most probably it’s the community perspective that has been assessed in the present study that adds something to the field. Knowing the existing literature and their own results well, the authors should try to summarize these new elements in one or two sentences; in this, the authors should try to be
as specific as possible, rather than giving general implications # page 14).

Conclusion and utilization of research results:
# Page 14; it is not stated clearly which kind of policy implications the results could have on present IEC activities. The paragraph remains a bit general and blurry…

Quality of written English:
The language ahs improved, but the text still needs some polishing and editing especially towards the end of the paper).

General conclusion:
The paper has improved a lot. Major points of criticism that remain and hve not been fully addressed are the following:

1) Theoretical underlying approach of qualitative research
2) Use of existing health behavior theories in the research design and how the relate to the present findings
3) Presentation of results not differentiated according to different data collection techniques
4) Emphasis on new findings that this research has elicited
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