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Reviewer's report:

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes
3. Are the data sound?
   Yes.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes
6. Yes. I liked the discussion section, well argued and balanced. I am not quite certain that the Oraquick kits require no refrigeration if the temperature exceeds 35C-38C, the performance of the kit is impacted. There are a few studies that have evaluated this issue. So may be we need to tone that fact down a bit.
7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes. The survey was subject to detection bias. Partial verification bias and Incorporation bias. These could be acknowledged in the write up
8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes.
9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes.
10. Is the writing acceptable?
    Yes.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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