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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Louise Symmons

Please find below a point by point response letter to accompany our revised manuscript.

1. We note that you obtained ethical approval from the Cardiff Multi-Centre Research Ethics Committee. Please can you clarify whether this was an umbrella approval which covered all participating sites. If this is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this, including a reference to the relevant legislation.

The Cardiff Multi-Centre Research Ethics Committee gave overall ethical approval. Primary Care Trusts gave local governance approval for all participating sites. We are not able to specify,
in print, which sites these were because our ethical approval permissions require that we do not identify them. Text amended for clarity (Declarations section, lines 317-319, page 16).

2. We note that you have stated that written consent for publication was obtained from all participants, please can you provide clarification regarding what participants consented to publish. If participants consented for the publication of their anonymous quotes please clearly state this.

Participants consented for the publication of their anonymous quotes. Text amended for clarity (Declarations section, line 325, page 16).

3. In the Availability of data and materials section we note that you state that it is unlikely that your raw data will be made available. If the data cannot be made available please state this with a justification. We suggest using one of the following data availability statements in this section:

- The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study are available in the [NAME] repository, [PERSISTENT WEB LINK TO DATASETS]
- The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.
- All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article [and its supplementary information files].
- The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study are not publicly available due [REASON WHY DATA ARE NOT PUBLIC] but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.
- Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.
- The data that support the findings of this study are available from [third party name] but restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under license for the current study, and so are not publicly available. Data are however available from the authors upon reasonable request and with permission of [third party name].
- Not applicable. If your manuscript does not contain any data, please state 'Not applicable' in this section.
4. In the Acknowledgements section we note that you have stated that your research was supported by the “National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Collaboration for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care South West Peninsula at the Royal Devon and Exeter NHS Foundation Trust.” If they provided funding for your study this should be declared in the Funding section. All sources of funding for the research reported should be declared in the Funding section.

Moved to funding section (Declarations section, lines 338-342, page 17).

5. We note that you have not included the abbreviation PCT in the ‘List of abbreviations.’ Please ensure that all abbreviations present in the text are listed in this section.

Added (List of abbreviations, line 311, page 15).

6. Unfortunately Table 1 contains too many indirect identifiers which compromise the anonymity of the patients. It is our policy to not publish more than 2 indirect identifiers without consent for publication from participants. We therefore suggest providing this data as a summary in the manuscript text instead.

Table removed. Data summarised in text (Methods section, lines 111-114, page 6).

We also note that you have provided the ages of some of the participants in the quotes. We suggest providing these as age ranges instead in order to ensure anonymity.

Ages changed to ranges (Results section, lines 167, 169 & 178, page 9).
7. Please submit your revised manuscript as a clean copy without any tracked changes, coloured or highlighted text, as these are no longer required at this stage of the editorial process.

Track changes and any coloured or highlighted text removed.

I hope that these corrections are satisfactory and that you are able to accept the article for publication.

Yours Sincerely,

Cath Quinn