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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting paper. The background and introduction described the issues related to unclear practice issue for which little is known. The aim of the study was clear. Methods: this was reported as a mixed methods study, however, I think it is more of a qualitative descriptive study that used multiple methods--the n for the survey was small and mostly descriptive. If the authors wish to report this study as mixed methods, I think they should be more explicit about how the methods were mixed and for what purpose. See Creswell and Plano for more information: https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/designing-and-conducting-mixed-methods-research/book241842#description  The interview guide was not provided and would provide greater rigor. It would help to provide a reference for the process for which a thematic analysis was conducted, and describe more about who conducted the analysis, and if there were any other researchers involved in the process. How were the participants recruited for the interviews and surveys? What did the survey include and how was it developed? The results are presented well, and used good examples. The discussion is sound and offers many important implications.
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