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Reviewer's report:

The paper provides an applicative description of how well to use stringent criteria for ensuring rigor in qualitative research. Below are suggestions that can help improve the paper further.

Abstract

I think the link between the background and why the study was done is weak. The paper generally is an attempt to illustrate the role of using rigorous approaches in conducting qualitative studies in an emergency setting. This emphasis would be of great value if well presented in the abstract. Second, the conclusion are generally weak and could be strengthened.

Background

The section could be made better if the authors were able to link the broader study with the methodological rigor used in the paper. For example, the lip from paragraph 2 and three in page 2 need to be clear to show the reader that they used the broader study context to illustrate how the methodological rigor can be achieved in an emergency setting while using qualitative methods.

Results

Although the authors provide a detailed process used in the application of each of the steps involved, the do not provide insights on the learning of employing each technique ie what did the process lead to? how did the process help ensure the FDC elements were achieved? This observation perhaps could either be added in the discussion section or may be integrated all along the results section.
Discussion and conclusion

These two sections in my view are weak. Key suggestion to make it better may include but not limited to:

1. More reflections on the role of each of the approaches employed and its utility in improving results generated

2. What other studies have done while using the rigor described

3. Conclusion is generally weak with sweeping statements like in page 13 line 26-27

4. What is the utility of the rigor described in emergence setting? How different could it be in other settings?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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