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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article again. The authors appear to have made conscientious and comprehensive efforts to address all reviewer concerns.

In terms of the 10 key questions asked by BMC below I feel that most of these can be answered in the affirmative with perhaps the exception of Q 6. Additionally, the redirecting of the scope and improved issues in clarity make this a more solid piece of work.

Discretionary issues/revisions

My major concern still remains the use of a qualitative analysis system that doesn't use the specific data in terms of quotes to support the thematic and content based findings. Even if this had one quote for each item in the table (table 3) it would help show the work and where it came from without significant word length issues? Additionally, some of the responses regarding issues identified by all reviewers on qualitative methods, and the mixed nature of the data downplayed that issue with the newer scope, but I am still a little confused as it appears to be as important to the results. Apologies if I have misunderstood. I have highlighted this as discretionary subject to editor guidance in relation to word limits etc.

In relation to your recommendations (No 2) I think this is interesting and needs to be considered up front in the grant submission process as well. We are starting to do this better but I think your point is well made.

Yes to all with exception of no 6.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
3. Are the data sound?
4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? I still am concerned that the qualitative data are represented well.
7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
10. Is the writing acceptable?

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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