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**Reviewer’s report:**

This is a well written article. I disagree with adding audio to the title as it makes it quite cumbersome, but it is not a serious concern.

I read the authors comments and citations on purposive sampling and accept their approach, which was my only major concern with the paper. I do believe that it would be worthwhile including some of the comments written in the cover letter in the methods section of the manuscript. I would recommend the authors make this change.

Other comments
The authors write
"or through the use of video podcasts". They may wish to define those as vodcasts "or through the use of video; in this case they are known as vodcasts"

There is some ambiguity about which study they refer to in the paper and they do refer to a previous study of theirs quite often which can cause confusion. I would suggest they use "previous study" and the "current study" consistently to avoid ambiguity
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