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Thank you for your revisions to the paper.

Major Compulsory Revision

My initial comment about the inconsistency between the qualitative data analysis and the sample of participants interviewed remains.

In the section 2 ‘Qualitative interviews…’ the description of the data analysis, and reference used, indicate that a grounded theory approach has been taken, although the use of themes is not usual with this approach as it is used for theory development. In the constant comparative method interviews are analysed as they occur and findings from one interview are compared with the next interview and so on. This process continues until no new data is emerging from the interviews (data saturation). Therefore, using this method of data analysis, the sample number of interviews cannot be determined in advance as it is not possible to predict how many participants will be required until data saturation is achieved. To clarify, your description about the patient interview sample is very clear. It is the description of the qualitative data analysis that needs to be revised.
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