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Reviewer’s report:

I have read the author’s responses to all reviews and the amended manuscript. I feel that the authors have addressed most the comments and suggestions of the reviewers.

The paper is certainly not written in the style one expects from an indepth qualitative paper, even the section on reflexivity/ rigour while added is still limited. Despite this, I accept the authors responses to this section in that the paper is targeted to triallists/clinicians. I would however suggest that the sentence ‘For the purposes of this paper, by request of the Chief Investigator and the ZICE Trial Management Group, this paper shows a less nuanced analysis than might be expected for a social science audience, and is designed to engage with triallists and clinicians. ’ should be reworded, to reflect a more positive view of its use for triallists/clinicians, are you in effect over-justifying the paper style.

I note that one reviewer had suggested more links to literature in the discussion section but do not see evidence of this in the resubmitted manuscript.

I feel the main strength of this paper in that there is minimal literature within trial studies that considers the participants qualitative views as an outcome and thus this paper contributes to the current literature, taking into account that the Cox paper was published back in 2000.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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