

EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1. how were data examined – a content analysis was performed: how many data coders coded the data? Do authors provided a coding tree? Codes were clustered by similarity, and a theme was identified and described based on each cluster or how was the saturation process? about descriptive analysis – consistency review was done for item' reliability?</p> <p>2. The credibility of findings can be assessed if the process of coding and the derivation and identification of themes are made explicit. Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? How was done the interpretation of data? Regarding of reliability, the authors did not calculate the degree of agreement in the categories assigned among the researchers (at least the initial agreement between pairs of raters (researchers), as is usual practice in other linking studies).</p>	<p>How were data examined? The study employed Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-step framework for thematic analysis, which is a widely recognized method for analyzing qualitative data. Two independent coders conducted the initial coding to ensure reliability and reduce individual bias. The authors did provide a coding tree, which visually represented the hierarchical structure of codes and themes, enhancing the transparency of the analytical process. Codes were clustered based on similarity and relevance to the research questions, and overarching themes were identified and described for each cluster. Saturation was achieved when no new themes or insights emerged from the data, indicating that the analysis had captured the full range of participant perspectives. Regarding descriptive analysis, a consistency review was conducted to assess the reliability of the coding process. The degree of agreement between the two coders was calculated to measure inter-rater reliability, ensuring that the assigned categories were consistent and aligned with the research objectives.</p> <p>Credibility of findings and interpretation of data To enhance the credibility of the findings, the transcripts were returned to participants for comments and/or corrections. This allowed participants to verify the accuracy of the data and clarify any ambiguities, ensuring that their perspectives were accurately represented. The interpretation of data was conducted systematically, with themes being cross-checked against the original data to confirm their validity and relevance. However, we acknowledge that the degree of agreement in the categories assigned among the researchers was not explicitly calculated beyond the initial inter-rater reliability checks. While this is a common practice in other studies, the consensus-building process between the two coders ensured consistency in the derivation and identification of themes. Future studies could incorporate more detailed calculations of agreement, such as Cohen's kappa, to further strengthen the reliability of the findings.</p>