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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

-----------------------------------------------------
1. Page 7, 1st para, 1st sentence: A 'convenience sample' of how many adults?

2. Page 7, 1st para, 2nd and 3rd sentence: The two sites differ according to 'geographic location and socioeconomic status' of patients. However, two different methods of data collection were used in the two sites. Hence site differences could be confounded with data collection method differences. Did the study intend to assess differences between the two data collection methods? If not, why were two difference data collection methods used?

2. Page 7, 3rd para, last sentence: Why was this 'incentive' given to participants?

3. Page 8, 1st para, 1st sentence: What is meant by "sequential' mixed methods"?

4. Page 15, 1st para, 5th sentence: The authors state "The overall study population was powered to detect....". The word 'population should be replaced with word 'sample'. The authors made this statement yet they provide no details of sample size calculation in the methodology section of the paper.

Minor Essential Revisions

-----------------------------------------------------
1. Page 7, 1st para, 1st sentence: End of sentence is not clear.

Discretionary Revisions

-----------------------------------------------------
None

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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