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Author's response to reviews: see over
The changes that have been made are the following:

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1.) Detailed description of the intervention have been added to explain better the intervention to address this lack of information (lines 116-121 and 123-125).
2.) Study design have been added to give the reader an idea of the time frames for the different arms of the study (lines 175 and 180).
3.) Presentation of quantitative findings: Table 3 (mentioned in line 179) has been added to explain what topics exactly were covered in the satisfaction survey. Presentation of the main quantitative findings is pointed out in table 2.
4.) Headings and subheadings have been made clearer and some of them tightened.
5.) Indicators used in the satisfaction survey have been added in Table 3.
6.) The variables that are being analysed with the survey have been added in line 178 and in Table 3.
7.) Clärification regarding when the results come from the qualitative or the quantitative arm of the research have been done in lines 310, 313, 323, 440
8.) Qualitative and quantitative results have been clearly distinguished in every subsection/variables, except for the variables that are only extracted from the qualitative part, i.e. “Recruitment process”, “Reasons for acceptance or for rejection”, “Suggested improvements”.
9.) Another quote from FGD has been added in line 295-297

**Minor Essential Revisions**

1.) Line 216 has been added to explain why a sample of 746 households was unrealistic.
2.) Line 254-259 have been added to explain the coding process.
3.) Explanation about what is the charted qualitative data has been added (lines 254-259)
4.) Numbers of rejections have been included in lines 213 and 335.
5.) Explanation about the screen survey has been addressed in line 176.
6.) Table 2 has been re-created to make it more comprehensible.
7.) The words ‘catastrophically’, ‘little appetite’, ‘inputted’ and ‘relaxed’ have been changed in lines 74, 106, 239 and 83.
8.) Every LN has been replaced by LLINs
9.) A brief commentary about how violence was important for the study has been written in lines 162-163.
10.) Age range has been added in line 273
11.) The description of the two research arms has been clarified in line 167-168.
12.) Results/Responsibility for dengue prevention has been clarified in line 293
13.) Limitations of the study have been added in lines 529-535

**Discretionary revisions**

1.) Awkward phrasing in the abstract already changed in lines 36-37
2.) Ae. from aegypti has been separated in line 86 and everywhere else.
3.) Comma after LN has been removed (the one before the word stop in line 88)
4.) Numbers at the beginning of a sentence has been replaced by words in lines 154, 205,
Apart from all these corrections one author has been added. A mistake committed at the beginning of the submission has been fixed.