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Reviewer’s report:

General

Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

The question is not new, but well defined and there are very few other studies on this topic.

Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

The description of the methods can be improved (see detailed remarks section). It would be of help if the exact interview questions were given in order to provide sufficient information to replicate the work.

Are the data sound and well controlled?

Yes for the quantitative data, not clear for the qualitative data.

Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

See suggestions for improvement in the detailed remarks section.

Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? YES for the discussion, not for the conclusions.

Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? YES
Is the writing acceptable? YES

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

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)