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Reviewer's report:

a. Minor Essential Revisions
1. The manuscript needs to be edited by an English writer. There are numerous grammatical and spelling errors and words used are not always in the proper context.
2. Although the study question is well defined, the data is not fully interpreted and utilised to answer the questions posed in the objective.
3. Figure 2 is duplicated in the manuscript.
4. Under Methods section in the Abstract: The questionnaire was not piloted to refine the questions and determine if the dialect translations were correct.
5. How was interviewer bias prevented where interviewees were not literate.
6. Why were 6 villages chosen in study site 2 compared to 3 villages in the other sites.
7. Words need to be written out in full at first mention and then abbreviated thereafter. For example, no explanation is given of what “FSLC” is.
8. Under Results, Socio-demographic characteristics, b) Sex distribution of household heads: This interpretation is very difficult to follow.
9. Discussion overlaps significantly with Results section. Lots of repetition.
10. Under Discussion, Socio-demographic characteristics, b) Distribution of household heads according to sex: Why is this study being compared to India which has a totally different culture and vectorial system.
11. Under Discussion, Socio-demographic characteristics, b) Matrimonial Status: Not quite sure what religion has to do with marital status.
12. Under Discussion section, Knowledge, Attitudes … General knowledge of Malaria: Once again an inappropriate comparison with Swaziland as it has a different epidemiological profile and culture.
13. Throughout the Discussion section, comparisons need to be made with other Cameroonian studies or studies conducted in the same region.
14. The conclusion section is rehashing what was said in the Discussion section. The conclusion should consider the data in the context of the objective of the study and make some kind of recommendation for public-private malaria control.
What does the findings of this study reveal? How will this inform the public-private partnership.

15. There were obviously challenges in conducting the study but no limitations hampering the study were discussed in the manuscript.

16. References numbers 6 and 7 do not appear in the body of the manuscript.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

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