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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the manuscript. I have read the paper with interest and have some comments which will hopefully improve the paper.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Methods

Please give some more information about the process of the data analysis. For me it is not clear whether predefined categories were used for coding the interviews.

Results

I recommend not using the term ‘category’ in the results section, since it is confusing in combination with ‘theme’ and ‘subtheme’.

The quantitative description of the number of experts describing specific opinions might be misleading in a study with qualitative interviews. This suggests that a higher frequency of an opinion indicates a higher relevance or value of this opinion and this seems not appropriate on the basis of the data presented.

Theme 1 is very unspecific; NHO is the topic under investigation and therefore it should be avoided in the title of the theme.

I also recommend adding more subheadings to the themes with subthemes to increase the clarity of the results section.

Minor Essential Revisions

The figures are labelled with the numbers 1 to 4; however, the manuscript refers to figures 1 and graphs 1a-c. In the figure legend (page 23), graph 1a is mentioned twice.
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