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Reviewer's report:
First, I must felicitate you for dare to investigate under qualitative paradigm and write about CL/P, for me is an important and deserted matter.

Recomendations

1 Redaction
I do not know how scientific writing works in UK, but for me is inappropriate to use acronyms without previous description, in this case CL/P calls my attention in abstract segment, this is only a suggestion, use your prefered criterion.

2 The substantial issue that implicates further improvements to this paper is "methods" section:

2.1 please try to develop what is a qualitative approach

2.2 You are using heuristic tools from social sciencies, in fact this tools are very focused and well applied, the mistake is to forget giving credit to social sciences theories. In this case "facilitators" and "barriers" concepts are well puzzled with Harold Garfinkel ethnomethodology; situations of "everyday life" as tooth brushing behaviours and rituals are synthonized with Alfred Schütz and their disciples Berger and Lukmann phenomenology, also "everyday life" cathegory constructed by Heller could fit in some theoretical aproximations used as specific tools to approach your subjects of study. For me there is a lack of background contextualizing.
As a suggestion, try to draw a little heuristic map (as a figure, as a mental map, as a flux diagram of theory, etc.), and write maybe one paragraph to contextualize background a little to amplify the qualitative matter.

2.3 Following with "methods" section, you need to describe and show your specific interview guide (figure form is preferred). I know that this is an exploratory study, also a semi structured questionnaire is not properly a interview, but the "qualitative researchers" applied a topic guide called "script" or "interview guide" in order to not improvize outside your principal aims.

2.4 Finally, it seems that you have some brushstrokes of grounded theory data analysis method, but also a little of biographic method, maybe you have constructed your own data analysis method based in this two models and the cathegory you have named "inductive thematic analysis", please, be more specific about how do you analyzed the participants discursive data.

3 "Results" section: you need to be more dynamic and square, I know that this is a qualitative approach, and speach is the king, but creating a mental map of topics or a code list and its content could be great (garish figures), remember that qualitative studies still in the fight of land inside biomedical field, specifically in health promotion, your main audience must be health policy makers or public health authorities, so please construct something understandable for them, they are used to cold numbers and a ton of tables and graphics, please, try to put a foot in both worlds at least in presenting results.

your work is a very good example of excellent qualitative approach, try to support a little more your methods and try to be a little more square and "scientific", this will lead you to call the attention of the right public. I am being a little exigent because I do not want that someone else criticize your work without a right argument.
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