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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to reviewers:

1. We note that the order of authors has changed since original submission of the manuscript. In line with COPE guidelines, BioMed Central requires written confirmation from all authors that they agree with any proposed changes in authorship of submitted manuscripts or published articles.

Response: Please note that this change in authorship was due to a miscommunication on my end and has been reversed. We apologise for any confusion.

2. Please provide a list of all the abbreviations used in the manuscript. This list should be placed just before the Declarations section. All abbreviations should still be defined in the text at first use.

Response: This has been revised accordingly.

3. In your “Ethics approval and consent to participate” section of your declarations please confirm if an ethics committee approved the use of verbal consent instead of written, and
why verbal consent was used rather than written. Please also detail how you documented the consent.

Response: This has been revised accordingly.

4. In order to protect participant anonymity, please present ages alongside quotes as age ranges rather than exact age.

Response: This has been revised accordingly.

5. In the Funding section, please also describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Response: This has been revised accordingly.

6. Please include a statement in the Authors' contributions section to the effect that all authors have read and approved the manuscript, and ensure that this is the case.

Response: This has been revised accordingly.

7. Please upload your list of references as part of the main manuscript.

Response: This has been revised accordingly.

8. Please separate your Conclusions from your Discussion, providing a clear, separate Conclusions section in your manuscript.

Response: This had been revised in an earlier version and should be as requested already.

9. Please clarify whether the interview guide used in your study was developed for this study or has previously been published elsewhere. If the interview guide has been published elsewhere please provide a reference to it in your manuscript, if the interview guide was developed for this study please upload an English language version as a supplementary file.
Response: The interview guide used in this study was developed for this particular study, but we do not have a copy of the actual guide at hand at this moment. We have contacted the consultant in DRC who conducted the study on the ground but have not yet heard back from him. We are a little unsure what information we will be able to receive from him given that several years have passed since the study and he also had his computer stolen since, leading to the loss of some files.

10. Thank you for uploading your response to reviewers, and title page. As these files are no longer required at this stage of the editorial process, please remove them from your submission.

Response: This has been revised accordingly.

11. Please upload your revised manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. Please also ensure that all figures/tables and supplementary files are cited within the text. Any items which are not cited may be deleted by our production department upon publication.

Response: This has been revised accordingly.