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Reviewer's report:

I am happy with the revisions made by the authors in response to my comments. The research design and sampling are clearer now and I understand better the limitations to integrating the quantitative and qualitative data, due to the sequential nature of the data collection and limited resources available for the project.

I would still argue that both data streams are not really integrated and instead are, as the authors' suggested, complementary to each other. Perhaps follow-up research could look in more details at the intersection of framework usage and evaluation metrics.

Ideally, I would have liked to see a bit more detail on the analysis of missing data in the survey responses; summing this analysis up as 'inconclusive' doesn't really explain why 53% of the responses were omitted and how this affected the representativeness of the retained data. However, I value the authors' reflections in the discussion on their own roles and experiences and would like to congratulate the authors on writing an article of importance in its field.
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