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Author's response to reviews:

Understanding of Research: a Sri Lankan Perspective

Reply to reviewer comment

Reviewer: Christine Grady

Comments are provided according to numerical order of the original review report.

1. Thank you.

2. Thank you

3. Authors thank the comment of the reviewer. The answer to first comment on theme definition is given in the results section. Answer to the comment on percentages no adding up is explained also in the results section. These two points were important and we have added explanations on how themes were defined and why some percentages don’t add up to 100% to the paper.

4. Unfortunately, the authors did not initially receive the sample table mentioned by the reviewer. We requested BMC editorial board and the sample table was only sent a day or two before the re-submission deadline. We have taken the reviewers suggestion and tried to arrange tables for several results. The table
format was limited to some responses as the authors felt it was not matching to some responses.

The verbatim themes were put into the paper just to support the evidence of themes. It was not put in any order to match the defined themes and frequencies. The authors thought that if the verbatim responses were matched to thematic order, it would lose the originality. So the authors would like to see the presentation unchanged.

Regarding the comment about distinguishing meanings; the authors would like to respond saying that Sinhala language, in which the interviews were conducted is quite complex. Several words can describe the same meaning and the usage of words may differ depending on participant. Some participants used several different words similar in meaning to describe what they wanted. Some used single words. Depending on the written interview records, it was assigned to participants.

5. The authors have tried to widen the debate by discussing what is reasonable. Also answers are provided to comments based on Sri Lankan specific context.

6. Limitations section was not changed as authors felt it discussed main limitations.

7. This paper is the 3rd and final part of a bigger study for which the references were given. Although it was a part of another, its methods were unique and standalone from others. So authors think that provision of the previous references and keeping the originality of the current study is appropriate.

8. Authors acknowledge this and the title has been changed accordingly.


Understanding of Research: a Sri Lankan Perspective

Reply to reviewer comment

Reviewer: Michael Parker

Comments are provided according to numerical order of the original review report.

1. The authors acknowledge this comment and also would like to say that the
focus was on Asian context. However, reviewer’s suggestions have been followed and other literature from African context has been added to the introduction. Also other suggested guidelines have also been added.

2. These differences are explained in the beginning of the results section. Authors thank reviewer for mentioning this.

3. Authors acknowledge the discrepancy in the length and presentation of two sections. Both sections have been edited substantially to answer first reviewer’s comments. Authors hope that this will make the paper much more presentable. The other reason that authors would like to mention for a long methods section is that, although this paper is part of a bigger study, this part of the study is unique and standalone. So it was felt appropriate to describe methods in details.