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Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format. Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

Thank you for submitting your manuscript. Overall it is well written and provides the reader with insights into the Qatari cultural and academic context.

Several questions arise:

a) Your focus group method, while appropriate, appears somewhat underpowered. A total of 10 participants from two different stakeholder groups makes me wonder whether your findings are truly indicative and trustworthy, or whether they are simply an artefact of a small number of individuals. It is not clear why additional focus groups - particularly with faculty members - were not undertaken to broaden representation. On the one hand you do note that there is not necessarily a claim for generalizability of findings given the small number of participants, yet you do make some fairly strong conclusions regarding barriers and facilitators. While there is nothing that is particularly unexpected or unreasonable in your findings, I worry that your method did not permit sufficient number of naysayers to be involved and have their voices heard and accounted for in this study.

b) There seems to be a preponderance of North American -linked educators in your study; it is unclear how this experience may influence "Qatari cultural context" issues and again how representative, indicative and trustworthy your findings actually are.

c) While I recognize and applaud the significant amount of work you've undertaken in drafting this well-written manuscript, I feel overall it would be a more meaningful piece of work had you simply undertaken more focus groups with a broader range of faculty members. "Lumping" administrators and faculty members together has operational advantages but it's not clear that members of each group actually have the same needs, interests and agendas.

d) My concern is that your potentially interesting and well written manuscript will simply be dismissed by many readers who will worry about your sample size and sampling strategies. While it may be very relevant and acceptable in your specific local context, readers from other contexts will need reassurance that what you found actually is relevant to them.
e) Your analysis seems reasonable, though I worry that it is overburdened with details and so multi-factorial that it becomes overwhelming for readers. A more streamlined and digestible model of factors would be helpful, perhaps with some sense of weighting or prioritization of factors in terms of their influence and importance. Right now you've generated a long list of issues but it's not clear what the really important ones are and what the less important ones may be. Your work in weighting these factors might be simplified if you undertake more focus group work and ask those participants to help you refine and tighten this model of factors.

Thank you again for your work - best wishes in taking it to the next step!
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