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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We have found these comments extremely helpful. We are pleased to submit the revised manuscript with responses all to the issues raised.

Editor Comments:

1. Authors’ contributions

-- We have noted that author [AT] is missing in the listed authors’ contributions. The individual contributions of ALL authors to the manuscript should be specified in the Authors’ Contributions section. Guidance and criteria for authorship can be found here:

Response: We have indicated what he did, working together with IG.

http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship
Currently, the contributions of authors [VM] and [KP] do not automatically qualify them for authorship. In the section “Authors’ contributions”, please provide further clarifications on their contributions. An 'author' is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study. To qualify as an author one should 1) have made substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; 2) have been involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and 3) have given final approval of the version to be published. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content. Acquisition of funding, collection of data, or general supervision of the research group, alone, does not justify authorship.

Response: We appreciate that this was an omission on our part in failing to detail the crucial roles played by VM and PK. We have done that in the text.

2. Consent for publication

-- In your “consent for publication” section, please confirm whether participants gave consent for direct quotes from their interviews to be published in this manuscript. Response: We are sorry for this obvious omission. We described how we went about getting their consent for publication.

3. Funding

-- In the Funding section, please also describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript. Response: The funders had no role in the conceptualization, design, evaluation and preparation, and write up of any reports or scientific papers arising out of this research. We have indicated that in the text.

4. Clean copy

Response: We have uploaded a clean copy of the manuscript.