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Reviewer's report:

This work addresses an interesting topic but I am afraid I cannot recommend it for publication without major compulsory revisions.

1) I sympathise with authors who are not native English speakers, but none the less there are a number of grammatical errors which must be corrected. I am afraid I cannot proof read the article for the authors.

2) The paper is clearly qualitative in nature, but the authors do not explain their methodology. For instance, the analysis process is inadequately described.

3) The paper in general is repetitive and in the discussion in particular points made previously are repeated without adding to the true discussion of the results. I am sure it can be significantly shortened by removing these repetitions. ‘Results’, ‘Methods’ and ‘Discussion’ sections should contain only the content indicated by their heading.

4) The authors conclude that this method is ‘effective’. However, no data is presented on efficacy. This is a satisfaction survey only.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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