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Reviewer’s report:

This is an exploration of patient views around ambulatory oxygen. The authors have conducted 27 interviews with patients that have been prescribed ambulatory oxygen alongside LTOT. This is a timely exploration of patients’ views.

Major comments

- It would be helpful to have some more details about the patients’ clinical status
- Please confirm all patients had been prescribed AO alongside LTOT and not directly as a consequence of exercise desaturation?
- Was a sampling grid used to ensure that all important patient characteristics/demographics were represented? (age, severity, social circumstance, weight of individual, may also influence ability to carry system).
- Had patients' participated in PR?
- A little more detail on the analysis would be helpful and the use of the second assessor. How was any divergence of analysis managed? Were practice interviews conducted to establish the schedule?
- How did the questions evolve from the attached schedule: Only the last question is associated with title and text? I would imagine the lack of perceived benefit might be important, whilst exercising/out of the home, was this discussed? Equally do you know if patients accumulated 15hrs with their LTOT or used the AO to reach 15hrs threshold?
- How was saturation reached?
- I would like some clarification as to how the interviewer remained detached in line with the principles of the approach adapted.
- Would be helpful to understand which is the most important problem weight or embarrassment.
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