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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for answering my previous comments so thoroughly. The technical reporting of the paper is now much improved, and my initial thoughts that this is an important research question has been confirmed.

I have only one recommended revision: this is certainly not "grounded theory" in the true sense intended by Glaser and Strauss - it is only fair to call it as "thematic analysis" - i.e. a descriptive aggregation of themes rather than an attempt to generate theory, which is the hallmark of a true Grounded Theory approach. Yes, the analysis is "grounded" in the data (i.e. an inductive), but this does not qualify it as Grounded Theory. As mentioned in my first review, Grounded Theory explicitly attempts to build theory, coding goes through 3 stages (open, axial, selective), there is an iterative approach to data analysis and data collection guided by theoretical sampling and thematic saturation, and that deviant cases are actively sought to test the developing theory. This study did none of these things therefore to call it a "grounded theory" rather than "thematic" analysis would be misleading.
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