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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the article "Following the MH17 plane crash in the Ukraine: A qualitative interview study of grief after the sudden loss of a colleague or neighbour". The manuscript explores a really interesting topic in the field of grief that have not received enough attention in previous studies. Through a qualitative analysis authors identify the importance of grief reactions in colleagues and neighbours of people who died in the MH17 accident. The introduction is clearly written and the objective of the research is justified. However there are some major issues in the Methods and Results sections that should be addressed:

Method:

Authors indicate that they have followed the COREQ recommendations in the method section. Nevertheless most of the basic information to assure the rigor of qualitative research is absent in the manuscript. I strongly recommend that authors read carefully the COREQ paper and modify the whole method section. It is not included what type of qualitative analysis have they performed (i.e. phenomenology, content analysis, thematic analysis, etc.). Was the generation of codes inductive or deductive? How did authors create and modified the codes and the themes? What was the mean time of the interview? How were participants contacted? Did you use any kind of triangulation? Did you ended the interviews when saturation was reached? Were the interviews performed by the same researcher? In addition, more information is needed about the participants: Why three declined to take part in the study? What are the sociodemographic data of participants? Why only 6 neighbours participate in the study?

Results:

Authors identified a total of 11 themes. I think that the analysis is merely descriptive and that authors needs to integrate and to merge some of the themes. It seems that a theme was composed by two or three of the questions in the structured interview and it is complicate to follow. Also the quotations needs to be more informative of the subjective experience of the participants. Please include the full quotations of participants in all themes and specify if participant were male or female and if it was colleague or neighbour.

In sum, I think that the manuscript adress an important gap in literature but authors should add many information in the method section about data analysis, participants and procedure and refine the initial analysis (including more clear quotations).

Thank you again for giving me the opportunity to review this intersting article.
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