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Reviewer's report:

I think the authors have addressed most of my comments to an acceptable degree. However, I suggest that the following might still warrant further changes.

Re volunteer effect - the author's claim that "Interventions such as these will always be limited to those who are willing to attend, so this is not a limitation as such, just a reality" is quite wrong. Whilst I agree the problem is widespread and difficult to counteract, the fact remains that bias has occurred that limits generalizability. The section that has been added to the Discussion on this issue mistakenly calls this response bias rather than sampling or selection bias. Whilst it's OK to include details of response rate, I think readers should be left to make up their own minds rather than told 'it could also be a relatively accurate reflection of the population'. The single sentence on Kellehear's distinction between taboo and upsetting offers no explanation at all and, given it is just an idea not based on any evidence, should be omitted along with its sequela rather than expanded.

Re the justification for not undertaking more multivariate analyses - when the authors say that this was because 'experiences and attitudes did not vary by any socio-demographic variable', do they mean at the p<0.05 level or less conservative thresholds (e.g. p<0.25) more commonly used to include variables in multivariate models?

Re methods for open text analysis - 'thematic analysis' is a very minimal distinction. Was the approach inductive or deductive, and how many researchers were involved and agreement reached?

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.

Yes

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments
which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal