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Reviewer's report:

This version of the article is much better. At this stage, my recommendations are relatively minor:

General comment about the editing of the text
- Some sentences are unclear, often because they are too long; cf. for instance:
  - Page 4, 2nd sentence of section “material and methods”
  - First sentence of the 2nd paragraph page 5,
  - Last sentence of page 20
- Several sentences of the paragraph that the authors added in the discussion (“Another strength was the inclusion of a community sample (from social and community centres) within the territory as opposed to a clinical sample and thereby provided greater insight into the multitude of care pathways (both conventional and traditional means) and overcame the biases of perceptions of a treatment-seeking study group.”)
- The use of “that” and “which” is sometimes wrong
- I do not understand “individual focus group”, page 6

Results - The figure that the authors added is interesting. It would be useful to add a small paragraph describing this figure (when they introduce it).

Discussion
- The section that the authors added in the discussion still could be improved:
  - The sentences are long
  - I do not understand the last 2 sentences
  - The authors do not say much about credibility (triangulation?), the size of their sample (is it appropriate?)
- I regret that the discussion remains relatively superficial. The results and figure 1 are interesting indeed; they could have introduced a deeper reflection on theories and models about illness career, culture and illness, access to care (and competing health care systems or models) or professional competency. I know that this study is mostly descriptive, and that the goal of the authors is not to “theorize”, but I still feel that they lost a great opportunity to address important issues in the discussion. Furthermore, the authors did not provide concrete
recommendations to help people with OFP…

**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.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests