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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for responding to all of my questions and concerns. The revisions were nicely done. The methods, in particular, are much more comprehensive.

I only have one final question/concern:

All of the reviewers appear to have raised questions about the 'type' of qualitative study, the qualitative approach and methods used. The authors added in the revised version some references to grounded theory. Why didn't the authors mention grounded theory in the original version?

Typically in a 'grounded theory' study, you see the theory run throughout the paper. There is a theoretical framework or positioning at the outset/in the introduction, there is the grounded theory approach outlined in the methods, and then typically you see the theory and the generation of theory, which is grounded in the data acquired, in the results and discussion. I don't see this 'thread' run throughout the paper. Rather, what I see is a non-categorical qualitative study that employed data collection techniques from the grounded theory tradition. Is this, perhaps, a more accurate description? Either way, I would like the authors to comment on their use of 'grounded theory', when the results have not generated or added to any theory, at least not in an obvious/clearly articulated way.

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

Yes

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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