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Reviewer's report:

My overall decision for this manuscript is: MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS. Further, I am unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions.

I also have following comments, based on the checklist provided by the Journal:
1. An article of importance in its field.
2. Needs some language corrections before being published.
3. I declare that I have no competing interests.

The reasons leading to this decision are provided in the following paragraphs. All of the highlighted issues fall under category of Major Compulsory Revisions.

INTRODUCTION:
There were lot of statistics and important arguments in first couple of paragraphs in the Introduction section, but no references are provided.

Note 1 is not adequate and should be removed, not sufficiently supporting the argument.

Rationale of Research is not satisfactorily addressed. The last paragraph should summarize the main arguments and address what is known in literature, what is the gap, and how the planned research will address the identified gap. These arguments should be coherently addressed to increase the worthiness of the issue and study.

METHODS:
What about psychometric properties of the semi structured questionnaire.

Primary and secondary objectives should be clearly stated. Further information regarding questionnaires used what are the questions included and need along with clear outcomes and operational definitions, particularly in relation to this manuscript should be provided. Some information related to questionnaires is provided, but is not sufficient considering this study as part of other studies and abstract themes and outcomes.

There are two selection criteria provided in 2nd and 4th paragraph, confusing the reader.

RESULTS:
It seems authors have categorized results under themes, how these themes were generated and what type of thematic analysis was performed was not shown.

The result section contain lot of information and analysis; however, it was not clear whether this apriori or post hoc? Further relevance of these findings and analysis was not addressed in objectives and methods section. It seems these results were part of other studies and not particularly to this study. This information is also needed in order to assess use of appropriate statistical procedures.

DISCUSSION:
Limited discussion considering the results and many of the findings and arguments could be further stretched and discussed.
Again it seems discussion was based on themes, but how these themes were generated (inductive or deductive analysis) was not shown.

CONCLUSION:
It was very large, could be shorten. Study limitations should be separate from conclusions.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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