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Reviewer's report:

I find this manuscript much improved. A few suggestions for additional (minor) changes.

Page 6, first paragraph. I would recommend an introductory sentence/ linking sentence here. It might be because of the track changes, but I find it a little bit difficult to follow how you came to this section.

In the abstract you mention 42 clinics (up from 39 before) but in the main text you mention 39 sites (e.g. line 14, page 9).

Reviewer 2 asked for details of the qualitative interviewer. This information is useful and a (very) brief description could be included in the method section.

state that the focus group used the same guidelines as the one-to-one interviews.

I was recently asked when submitting a similar article to provide age ranges rather than exact ages for each of the participants because of ethical/ confidentiality concerns. Perhaps consider doing the same?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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