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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major compulsory revisions:**

1. The method section needs elaboration and better explanation. The term 'collective case study method' is new to me. It is a vague term - how are the cases selected? Further, the method of analysis is not mentioned - some sort of content analysis, if so how (manual or software?) Still further, I am worried about the comment that the data was collected by a former manager of the initiative and that this facilitated communication. It could also have had other influences on the data gathered. Perhaps these issues need to be checked by a qualitative methodologist?

**Minor Compulsory revisions:**

1. The wording could be tightened throughout. In particular the Introduction is rather wordy. As a result the paper reads a bit waffly and is too long.

**Discretionary revisions:**

1. I am unclear after reading the paper just what the essence of a LIC is. Perhaps a punchier summary of the findings would help.
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