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Reviewer’s report:

Global Challenges with IMCI Scale-up: Results of a Multi-country Survey
Goga AE; Muhe L

A. Major Compulsory Revisions

None

B. Minor Essential Revisions

1. Throughout the document abbreviations should always include the full name when first used; e.g. NPO, PHC, MOH
2. Abstract/Background – remove the brackets around “including follow-up”
3. Abstract/Methods – table 1 shows the result of three questionnaires while methods mentions only two
4. Abstract/Results – start on a new line; “lack of enough high caliber facilitators, instructors and trainers” should me mentioned as one of the commonest challenges to scale-up; why no comment about how countries addressed challenges to follow-up
5. Methods/countries – table 2 shows 27 countries in 6 regions, why say “26 countries and one region”
6. Methods/study procedures – Form C is mentioned but results not included in table 2 or mentioned again in the document; MOH not mentioned in methods
7. Results/line one – exclude the second mention of IMCI
8. Results/perceived challenges to scale-up – commonest challenges perceived by MOH/NPO must include HR related; five themes mentioned but only four given; was studying in a second language ever mentioned as a problem?
9. Results/challenges to follow-up – a few suggested language changes in the second para “…programme officers reported several attitudes and ..” “seemed unable to plan how follow up can be integrated..” “a group of participants also expressed a sentiment of despondency..”
10. Discussion – end of first para – “..scale-up of IMCI needs to be further investigated” as some investigation has already been done
11. Discussion – second para line eleven – focal person does not need a capital
12. Discussion – second para line 21 – “providing a more global perspective..”
13. Discussion – second para line 22 – “Thus the paper serves to ..”
14. Figure I – who was evaluated?; many abbreviations used
15. Figure II – who was evaluated?; what is “zorba POA”
16. Figure II sub-heading 3 - “Lack of resources for IMCI..”
17. Figure II sub-heading 3 line bullet six – “.training for untrained workers”
18. Figure III – who was evaluated?; data for trainees but no mention of them in results or discussion; frequency rather than “freq”; extra stop in last line
19. Figure IV – these four points are not the same as the three points mentioned in the last line of results
20. Table I – state what figures are given in brackets
21. Table II heading – delete “by region and country”
22. Table II – give meaning of abbrev MOH/NPO and CD/Fac; information missing in second last line; what about the results of form C?
23. Table III – many abbreviations in heading and table need to be spelled out or given at bottom of table

C. Discretionary Revisions

Under “Several approaches to overcome barriers to IMCI” in the discussion the authors should consider mentioning the distance IMCI project running in South Africa at present as this is a major alternative to ICATT and eIMCI
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