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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for asking me to review this manuscript. I am happy to note that the authors have amended their manuscript further to reflect reviewers’ comments. While I am satisfied that the authors have addressed these comments, there remains key issues on how these processes were enacted. For example please consider the below statements:

“To establish communication functions we made an internal analysis of texts and identified the use of terms, and content partnerships. Terms which had the ability to attract and organize text were searched (attractors for organizing semantic associative chains). The texts were read with care and re-read to identify key codes. Finally, we analyzed the properties of categories and explored connections between them. Interpretations were discussed between authors, and after analyses, concordance was reached. Resulting analysis was contrasted with those obtained from the quantitative study.”

As a researcher, I can decipher what those statements mean, but not easily. I struggle to understand what “semantic associative chains” actually mean. Similarly, what are “content partnerships”? I suspect this might be due to language issues but please use simple, understandable terms and avoid jargon. Another comment I would like to highlight is the above paragraph has no reference underpinning this. It is concerning because it is in the method section and yet the authors have not supported their methodology with key references.

Therefore my comments relate to two issues:

1. Writing which is easy to understand and doesn’t leave the reader confused. You can achieve this by avoiding jargon and using terms familiar to the readership (please refer to similar previous publications for terms and strategies have been used).

2. Please adequately reference your methods section so that the readership is confident on the processes underpinning this research initiative.

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**: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.