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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for inviting me to review this interesting paper. Burns are an important public health and gender inequality problem in developing countries. This paper uses a qualitative approach to assess the process of establishing mechanism of burns. In this approach they interviewed women affected by burn as well as the key stakeholders involved in their care and/or investigation. While the idea of study is very interesting and I would support it for publication, I see that it is still far from the reach of common scientific reader.

p.3. For example, the objective statement in abstract is too complicated for non-specialist reader to understand. Break the sentences, if you are presenting two or more ideas. Abstract has to be rewritten by simplifying the objectives and results, and in an order that is logical.

p.5. Similarly, the introduction lacks a clear justification that why this research is necessary. Authors can remodel their introduction by explaining epidemiology of burns in the developing country with focus on India, possible issues in investigating mechanisms, and the need to assess the process of investigation in this particular setting, and possible benefits to do so.

p.6. There is no need to introduce methods in introduction as was done in the paragraph preceding methods.

p.6 Please separate out measures (or the topics interviewed on) as a methods sub-section, and elaborate what was intended to be collected --- more than naming of the themes, currently provided.

p.7 It seems that you used personal interviews and focus groups, why this was done, what bias it may introduce in your result or interpretations

p.7. There are few details about data handling. I would like more details how the list of concepts was generated, whether it was aided by a software. The details are insufficient to judge the quality of data interpretation and analyses

p. 7 Please explain framework analysis in analyses.

p. 7. What were a priori questions. They need to be presented upfront with objectives or in measures, as appropriate.
p. 8. It is difficult to follow the results because there was no introduction of what to expect in the analyses section. Please try to elaborate your sequence of interpretation in the analyses so that a reader is helped through.

p. 9. Is grey market a constraint itself, why you use both in the heading.

p. 10. Collision of anguish and opportunity? It would have been better if some self-explaining titles are used, this is ambiguous to a reader who is unfamiliar of the research settings.

p. 8-21. To be discussed with editor. Results are too long. There are too many details about the process are described. I think general process information can be summarized in introduction, and in results, only the issues about the process, raised by the respondents should be mentioned.

p. 21. Please summarize results in the first paragraph of discussion.

p. 22. Discussion is OK and corroborates with results but should be reduced. Solutions to highlighted problems can be suggested.

p. 26. The conclusion is vague. No indication of interventions or future research and policy implications were summarized.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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