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Reviewer's report:

The overall paper presents interesting data regarding the topic and is well organized. Nonetheless, some aspects should be modified.

General comments

* While all the information presented is relevant and useful for the reader, it could be shortened. The overall extension of the manuscript could be reduced for a more effective communication with the reader.

* Numbers less that 10 are sometimes spelled in letters and sometimes indicated in numbers. This should be standardized

* The title is rather complex and could be simplified.

* L. 95-97: this sentence should be supported with a reference and, preferably, explained further. It does not add any valuable information to this section.

* L. 125: (0.25 current USD) could include the year of currency Exchange. Otherwise, it'll be unclear in the future.

* l. 290 "Among women We": we should be spelled without capital letter.

Methodology

* L. 188-1991: It is referred that saturation was achieved before including the fieldwork in Nyamasheke. It is understandable that a certain repetition of categories or content is achieved at a certain point, however, it must be mentioned that the exclusion of this fifth province might have contributed to valuable new data. Since conducting new fieldwork is probably
unfeasible at this point, I suggest just pointing out that there might have been a potential loss of finding contrasting data in this fifth province.

* In the description of the analysis technique, it is not clear if all the discursive data (interviews, transcripts from FG) were transcribed and processes in Atlas.Ti, or just some relevant verbatims.

Results:

While the writing structure of the results allows the reader to have a clear notion of the meaning of the categories, there are far too many verbatims. Perhaps a more synthetic approach could be developed, such as a table summarizing the different topics found.
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