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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for this manuscript. Here are my comments:

Introduction

The rational of the study should be more highlighted in the introduction section.

Methods

Did the authors decide to conduct 27 interviews or was it the result of the recruitment? This should be clarified in the methods section. In addition, on one hand, the authors speak about a one-month period to realize the interviews and, on the other hand, they mention the saturation stage. It is not very clear: was the saturation reached after 1 month?

The authors mentioned that "the samples were classified according to their age, work experience, and education". What does it mean? How did the authors proceed?

The study population should be detailed (+ inclusion and exclusion criteria).

Page 6: What do the authors mean by "trained researchers"?

Results

Overall, the presentation of the results is very descriptive; there should be more in-depth analyses.

The presentation of tables is not optimal at all. Table 2 is not clear enough.

Why is there no excerpt from interviews in "the intention of using the sunscreen" section?
For "SPF" (page 9): Abbreviations should be typically defined the first time the term is used within the main text and then used throughout the remainder of the manuscript.

Discussion / conclusion

Please discuss about the strengths and limitations of the study.
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