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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Seemingly there is no discussion of literatures in the "result and discussion section", only results. The conclusion section on the other hand is too long (10 paragraphs). Most of the text in the conclusion section should actually go to the discussion section.

2. There is hardly any international peer reviewed articles published after 2010 which has been included as references. The authors need to update this enable to enrich the discussion

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The authors suggested that having qualitative interviews conducted by trained interviewers instead of the authors taking part in the interview is standard practice. This would perhaps be standard practice in quantitative studies, but generally not recommended for qualitative studies. It is very difficult to analyze qualitative data credibly if the researcher did not take part in the interviews directly. This needs to be addressed by the authors.

2. The authors suggested that professionals were parts of the groups and individual quotes were not registered. This is rather strange as commonly in qualitative studies the whole discussion should be recorded and transcribed word by word (verbatim) before processed further for analysis. The authors need to explain why this was not the case, the implications for analysis and how this can be addressed.

3. The authors suggested that the fact that interviewes were recorded and responses were converging are sufficient to ensure quality of the study. There are actually a wide range of standard techniques which can be employed to ensure the quality of qualitative studies (e.g. audit trails, triangulation, having outside auditors or participants validate findings (member checks), peer debriefing, attention to negative cases, independent analysis of data by more than one researcher, verbatim quotes, persistent observation etc). The authors needs to argue to what extend such efforts have been made and implications to the study.
4. The authors stated that study limitation has been adequately addressed. Yet, not pointing out to which particular paragraph this is actually being addressed. There is much here to discuss for instance in term of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.
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