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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editorial team,

We are so grateful for the thought you put in to reviewing our manuscript, and we have responded to your comments/queries line by line below. Please do let us know if there is anything else we can further clarify.

Editor Comments:

1. We note that the age information in combination with quotes contains potentially identifiable information. Please amend this issue, by providing ages as age-ranges.

We have amended the text for each quote to ensure that each participant is identified with an age in a 5 year bracket (20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, etc). Thank you for this suggestion.

2. 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 in some cases rather than written. Please also detail how you documented the consent.
We have added the requested information to the ethic section. In short, yes, the UT Austin IRB approved the use of verbal consent for the interviews. The added text reads as follows: "Cognitive interview participants gave verbal consent to participate to minimize written linkage between their name and the subject-matter of the interviews, which was approved by the IRB. Interviewers documented verbal consent with their own signature and date for each interviewee that gave verbal consent."

3. We note that the corresponding author email address on the title page of your manuscript does not match that which is provided on our system. Please amend one of these so that they match.

I have changed the corresponding author's email address to my gmail address on the title page, to match the email address used in the system.

4. 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.

Thank you for this suggestion. We have added a sentence saying that the funders had no role in the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

5. 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.

We have done so, with this revised submission.

6. 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.

The interview guide has not been previously published, and so we have uploaded it here as a supplementary file, to which we referring the method section where we describe the content of the guide.

We are so grateful for you review and inclusion of this manuscript.
Many thanks,

Heidi Moseson and co-authors