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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for asking me to review on this manuscript once again. I must apologise for the slight delay due to the festive season being upon us. I would like to congratulate the authors on revising the manuscript, and addressing my queries. From my perspective, it certainly seems to have strengthened the manuscript. While several of the changes have been made, I still find it difficult to read, possibly to the writing style. Overall though, this version is much better than the previous one. I have few comments to make and they are listed below.

(1). Systematic search – in this section, the authors state that databases such as Medline, Cochrane and LILACS were selected. Given that there are several other databases (such as CINAHL), it would be worthwhile to justify why only three databases were selected. Also, as part of “systematic search” it is imperative to provide key terms used for searching. These terms are missing.

(2). While there has been additional information pertinent to qualitative data analysis, key information on ensuring rigour and avoiding bias has not been explained. This is especially important given that the sample selection was based on convenience sampling, which has several issues of bias. How did the researchers ensure issues of credibility, dependability and rigour were addressed? Given that this research used mixed methods, it is vitally important to identify issues of bias and rigour for the qualitative component.

(3). In my previous review, I had asked for clarification for the following “There are also statements here which are not explained nor referenced (symbolic structure and rhetoric identification”. This has not been provided and I am still unclear as to what they actually mean.
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