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Reviewer’s report:

I have only a few comments on the manuscript, which are:

*Abstract: Write out the full name of OA the first time mentioned.

*Methods, study design & data analysis; I miss a reference referring to a full description of the method of analysis that has been used. This would improve the trustworthiness and replicability of the study.

*Results, sample; this section belong to methods, not results.

*Last paragraph in discussion, p.21; "generalizability". I think it is preferable to use terms belonging to the qualitative tradition, rather than those belonging to the quantitative, when discussing quality. Therefore I suggest that you use "transferability" instead.

*The discussions part is long, and still miss a proper discussion of strengths and weaknesses of the study. Maybe these references can be helpful in discussions regarding study quality, even though they focus content analysis:

Graneheim UH, Lundman B. Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. Nurse Education Today. 2003 (24):105-12


Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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