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Reviewer’s report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are major issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Maybe - with major revisions
PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting study on self-perceived barriers to medical treatment among individuals with asthma.

Overall the report is well written and the study design was appropriate for exploring the question at hand. The interviews and exploration of the interviews is well covered in the results section.

However, the exploration of the themes and codes is lacking. There is a lack of development of the bigger picture - exploration of the behaviors and psychological process. Rather the report reads as a list of facts from the interview process and lacks a true qualitative approach. The study would benefit from input from an experienced researcher in qualitative methods.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

The authors need to explore the qualitative analysis in much more detail, suggest input from an experienced qualitative researcher.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Page 4
L 82 citation
L 84 citation
Page: 6
L 134 Was ethical approval sought and if so, please state from home, number etc.
L 135 - 143 This belongs in the intro, would also like to have some info around prevalence of the disease
L 143 Citation
Page: 7
L 159 be clear, were all individuals (other than those listed for exclusion) asked to participate or did the nurse only select some? When did recruitment take place (list date started and ended)
Page: 8
L 210 saturation may not have been reached if still new codes??


L 355 Results have lack of development around the themes - psychological, behavioural, attitudinal processes.

Page: 20

L 468 should state that while, very few new codes would be identified, it seems likely that some would be missed as full saturation was not met

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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:
Acceptable
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