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Reviewer's report:

General
The authors have addressed most of the points raised in the earlier review, but not always with sufficient detail. It would also have been more helpful if details of their revisions had been provided in the letter - saying "this information was included" was not helpful.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Two remaining concerns:
1) they say the questionnaire was pilot-tested and approved by a panel of experts. - more detail is needed here - how and where was it piloted, what sort of experts were on the panel
2) the indicate the questionnaire was "semi-structured" - I had asked previously if the qualitative interview guide was semi-structured. I do not know what a semi-structured quantitative questionnaire would be, and it may be the authors did not understand the use of the term. This term is usually used for qualitative interview guides that have a predetermined list of questions/topics, but which allow flexibility in probing or pursuing additional areas.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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