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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have considerably strengthened their manuscript. Language editing is still needed, but at this stage I have only one further suggestion for a discretionary revision: addition of a limitations section in the discussion was important, but the authors seem to go only half-way. Simply naming limitations may not be quite enough to help readers realize how much, or how little, these limitations could affect results and conclusions. For example, qualitative coding without the help of specialized software may be a hindrance, but excellent coding can also be done on paper or word-processing software. So this may not have affected the results at all. Do the authors feel that they are in a position to make an educated guess on the direction in which this, as well as under-representation of lay members, selection bias with non-participation by members from three ERCs, less flexibility in probing answers in depth, may have affected results?

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

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

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