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Reviewer's report:

For the most part the suggestions made by the reviewers have been handled well. However, there are still some issues that could improve this paper further.

2. P 9, p 1, l 6. Drop [in order].
3. P 11, p 5, l 2. There is inconsistent use of the number of dots. Since the dots replace 3 words [and so on] there should be 3 dots not 4 or more. Also P 12, p 1, l 1 and 2. Also P 12, p 5, l 1. Also P 13, p 1, l 4. Also P 13, p 4, l 3. Also P 14, p 4, l 4. Also P 15, p 2, l 2 and 3. Also P 33, p 4, l 1 and 2. Also P 34, p 1, l 1.
4. P 17, p 1, l 5. Where is the closing bracket intended to be, after [groups])?
5. P 28, Interviews first l. Add an [s] to [nurse] to read [nurses].
6. P 36, R(eference) 1, l 2. Insert the City and Country.
7. P 36, R 16, l 2. Why the different use of quotes ['] and ["]? Should they not be the same?
9. P 37 and 38. R 25 and 41 are the same. One can be deleted and then the numbering should be revised.
10. P 37, R 29, l 3. Should not [Dundee, Scotland.] be added?
12. P 38, R 49, l 3. Where is this located?
13. P 39 and 40, R 53, 56 and 75. Trials likes to include all authors up to 30 before using [et al]. Please insert the other authors.
15. P 40, R 70 and 76 are the same. Pick one and redo the numbering system.
16. P 40, R 77, l 2. Delete the [.] after [?].