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Reviewer's report:

General
This article is well-written and in good balance!

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
The purpose of the study must express clearly. Is the aim to build a theory or to clarify concepts. Usually in grounded theory method we create new theories. Results are in very concrete level! Perhaps it is possible to continue data analysis a little more (to create a hypothetical model) and in next step of the study to test it.

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)

Is it possibly to find some new articles about this topic because the litterature is "old".

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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