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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: Interesting topic; however, one that has been the subject of considerable research. This will make it difficult to publish. Need to make sure this is distinguished from other work in the literature on this topic to be clear how this adds. In general, the authors have done a good job describing the general need for this study, and the objective. In addition, there are clear methods. Where I had trouble with this paper is the description of the findings, which do not appear to describe new insights that are not widely known.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

1) Need to better describe the need for this current study, and what is unknown in the literature that this study seeks to answer, 2) Abstract does not provide sufficient detail to let a reader understand the results (only describes high-level themes), 3) Conclusions of the abstract are too editorialized, should describe findings, then don't go beyond that, 4) The recruitment strategy needs to be better described, specifically the list of possible people who were contacted, 5) The interview guide seems impossibly long and not feasible for a one hour interview, 6) Need more details on the methods to how the coding was done and how we should be certain this was done correctly, 7) The results section is thin, need to add more quotes or create a table of them, 8) In the discussion the literature is described but not really how this study fits in and adds (or doesn't?)

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

No
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.

No

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

No

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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