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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #1: Thank you for the chance to review your revised manuscript. There has been a substantial effort to address the concerns and suggestions raised by the reviewers. I feel the paper has been greatly improved as a result of these changes. The issue around the purposive sampling and small sample size still exists, but I feel that there is greater transparency regarding this process and the limitations that this brings to the generalisability of the findings.

Answer: Thank you for your feedback. I agree the paper has greatly improved and acknowledge that your comments and critique have made this a better version of the original draft.

There are still a few minor grammatical issues which need to be addressed:

Page 3, Line 56 - PTTD has not yet been defined. may be best to avoid abbreviation
Answer: Corrected, Line 56

Page 7, Line 145 - gap missing after full-stop
Answer: Corrected, Line 146

Page 11, Line 235 - Either Researcher's or Researchers' depending on your meaning
Corrected, Line 244

Page 12, Line 249 - Remove 'is'
Answer: Corrected Line 257

Page 19, Line 386 - "...in rehabilitation, "
Answer: Corrected, Line 396
Also, page 11 line 227 - The level of experience should be quantified (i.e. over 10 years experience).

Furthermore, in-line with qualitative methodology, and the experiences of the interviewer impacting on interpretation, a small amount more of detail would be good. I.e. has the interviewer worked in solo practice, in an interprofessional environment, public or private.
Answer: See Page 11, Lines 232-240.

Reviewer #2: Thank you for responding to my comments and congratulations on a paper that is of importance to the research area.

Answer: Thank you. The paper has greatly improved and acknowledge that your comments and critique have made this a better version of the original draft.