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Reviewer's report:

The revisions have substantially improved this paper. However, there are some aspects where further clarity would be helpful to the reader. No major or minor essential revisions are required.

Discretionary revisions

1 - in the background section, you refer to a "quick scan" as part of your scoping in preparation of this study. This might be more clearly explained as an "initial scan" or "preliminary scoping". By saying it was quick you are rather undermining the seriousness of your purpose.

2 - my suggestion about referring to social networking theories was to enhance your discussion of your findings. My knowledge of these theories emphasises the transient and organic nature of social networks, which could explain the decline in membership. Social networks continually renew and reinvent themselves - hence the move to Twitter/Facebook currently - posing a challenge for professional networking globally.

3 - in the limitations section you refer to "a deeper, interpretative analysis" currently being conducted. I wondered if you could have put this into context more clearly. Did you always intend to do this? or did your decision emerge because of the limitations of the thematic analysis?

Otherwise I am happy with the revisions made.
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