

Editor's comment :

Please find attached the Stage 3 revised manuscript with my comments. The paper can be accepted after the issues stated have been addressed.

Author's feedback :

Editor's comment: 8 participants * 6 FGDs= 48 individuals. So that is it only 36 participated? Were some individuals part of 2 or more FGDs- if so why? Elsewhere- see lines 152-3- the number is mentioned as 6 participants

Author's feedback: This was an oversight error which was supposed to be expunged during the preparation of the manuscript. The actual number of participants was **6 participants x 6FGDs = 36 individuals**.

The initially proposed number of participants as contained in the proposal submitted to the Oyo state Research Ethical Committee was 8participants per group. Unfortunately, this was however not realized because 8 persons did not consent to participate in the discussion while 4 others were delisted on the account of not meeting the criteria for inclusion

Editor's comment: Nowhere in the methodology is there any mention of why only 6 FGDs were conducted. Was 'information saturation' reached after 6 FGDs? Or was time a constraint?

Author's feedback: A small number of mortuary staff practice in the study area. In addition, it is a male dominated profession (see line 153). Theoretical saturation was reached as evidenced in the discussion.

Editor's comment: I know this is verbatim – but is the word 'contact' or 'contract' when translated from Yoruba?

Author's comment: This has been corrected to contract

Conclusion

Editors comment: This finding is not mentioned anywhere in the above discussion. Hence cannot be used in the 'Conclusions'

Author's comment: This has been expunged from the document