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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? No. The methods appear really fuzzy, and this section needs to be substantially improved before submitting to this or to another journal. It is not at all clear what the sampling criteria were nor if the 100 persons (quite small sample in my opinion, by the way) were selected randomly.
3. Are the data sound? No. For example, at bottom of page 6, one would understand that 83.3% of Bozi people and 16.7% of Yoho people were not favourable to RDT, but then, when one looks at table 1, one discovers that it is not so. There are several other examples.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? No, see above.
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? No, see above.
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? No.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Apparently yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Not very clearly, but this depend on the above mentioned limitations of the study.
9. Is the writing acceptable? Acceptable but should be improved (moreover with some French wording slipping from time to time).

General comments to the authors

This paper addresses an important area of operational research and one where behavioural – anthropological data are much needed. My major concern is that this is a mixture of a qualitative and quantitative study in which the quantitative part is poorly dealt with, starting with no declared sampling criteria, an inaccurate description of how the sample size was selected, and continuing with an approximate and somehow confusing reporting of results. Nevertheless, the paper is rich of useful information on qualitative and cultural aspects and would deserve publishing, more so because there are comparatively scarce data on these albeit crucial factors of the success of failure of a medical or public health action. If I may say so, my impression is that the first author has been left a bit
alone with no major support by the senior authors (note by the way that one of them, JU, appears in the authors’ contribution section but not as a front author…). I cannot recommend this paper to be accepted in the present form, but I might be willing to review a second submission once it has been extensively revised and improved by the senior authors.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.