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**Reviewer's report:**

1. Abstract, Conclusion, Para 1. “Organizational opinion…..are fundamental to understanding…….” It would seem that assessing organizational opinion is needed to gain an understanding but the opinions themselves are not fundamental to understanding.

2. Background, par. 2.
   The formatting for the references is incorrect.

3. Analysis
   It would be useful if the first 4 sentences of the analysis section (paragraph1), were moved to the procedures section. The process of editing and removing redundant statements seems more appropriate for the procedures section. This makes it clear that this was more of a data management step that occurred prior to participant sorting and rating. Current placement suggests it serves as a part of the analysis.

4. Analysis
   There is a mention of a scheduled interpretation session but this process was not fully described. Since the 4 participants were not able to attend was there another opportunity for participants to assist in the interpretation of the data? Or did the interpretation session only include the researchers? This should be clearly stated.

**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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