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Reviewer's report:

Congratulations in executing a study that addresses a complex subject. Here are some suggestions to improve the quality of the manuscript.

Line 11-14 (abstract). This is more or else an implication of the study's findings. Consider moving this sentence to the conclusion section of the abstract.

Line 15 (abstract): The first sentence under the methods section could be more complete. Could add "in the focus group discussion". Alternatively, the authors could consider merging the first two sentences of the methods section.

Line 27: consider replacing "women" with "participants."

The limitations section needs to be revised and the following issues addressed: Line 38-42 (the last part of this section) is currently framed more as an area for further studies than as a limitation.

Line 30: it is not clear why the authors used a first-person pronoun here although the study has multiple authors. Also, the information captured here in Line 27-37 although is relevant, the authors do not explicitly explain how these events could have impacted the results of the study.

Page 14-15 (Line 54-): Consider moving the discussion about the model (I think it should be called "proposed model" throughout the paper) to the findings section. Ideally, the discussion section of a manuscript should only discuss results/findings already presented and not the place to introduce new information.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
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