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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for your response and the comprehensive information provided regarding the amendments and changes that have been made to the piece of work. I find that the majority of the major essential revisions have been made, and enhance the article. However there are a few that I feel require further work to develop the piece of work.

Major compulsory revisions:

2. Methods. The sentence included in p7 is still contradictory, and does little to be explicit about, or to support, the choice of research paradigm. Equally, if Grounded theory and constant comparative methods were used, but not to develop a theory in this instance, this requires discussion within the limitations section of the paper.

6. Results. I appreciate the work that has been done by the authors to enhance the presentation of the results: the production of a table and the shortening of the results section by removal of mutliple quotes. However a table has only been produced for the barriers, and not the enablers, which I think does not provide a balanced view. Equally, I am afraid that I still feel that 23 pages in total for presenting the results, is far too long. There are some interesting findings that have emerged form this study, but at present, the length of the results section will not keep the reader engaged.

Additional comments

I would commend the authors on some really positive amendments to the paper. Specifically the inclusion of relevant background research in the introduction, the implications for practice section, and the work that has been done to develop the discussion. The latter two, in particular, offer some valuable insights and suggestions for practice to the reader and an overview of the findings and their relevance.

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

I declare that I have no competing interests