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Reviewer's report:

Acceptable upon minor essential revisions. Please see comments below:

Cover letter
Comment 1:
The authors could further benefit from proofing the cover letter (there is a mistake in the last paragraph where they repeat the same sentence twice).

Background
Comment 2: It reads well, it is very clear and comprehensive; there is an appropriate flow of ideas and provides the basis for what is later discussed.

Methods
Comment 3: It describes the objectives of the parent grant in a paragraph and only explains in three sentences from where the current research is taken (Phase 2 of the parent grant). It would be greatly appreciated if the authors could explain more about the objectives of Phase 2.

Results
Comment 4: I feel there are too many sub-sections in the results section that limit the depth and quality of the analysis. In some sections of the results the analysis is very superficial and does not provide a fertile soil for the discussion and in some instances there is no closure to the sections. Could some of these sections be brought together to allow this greater depth of discussion?
Also if there could be more consistency in the way the results are presented (format) because sometimes the quotes are within text (and the reader could get lost) and in others they are separated. If they could present them one-way or the other but just keep it consistent throughout the entire manuscript.

Complex and interrelated challenges: a summary
Comment 5:
I do not feel the authors make a clear or strong argument of how or why the challenges interrelate either they make a stronger argument or I would delete or merge this section with the discussion. However, the three quotes that are in this section are very good and could be used to exemplify some of the results (e.g., challenges associated with the infrastructure of the treatment settings)
Discussion

Comment 6: There seems to be a weak relationship between what is being discussed and the results presented. Could the authors ensure a stronger alignment between these different sections?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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