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Reviewer: Louise Kelly-Hope

Reviewer's report:

Review of the manuscript entitled: Use and acceptance of long lasting insecticidal net screens for
dengue prevention in Acapulco, Guerrero, Mexico

Overall the manuscript is well written and addresses important issues relevant to dengue control. However, there are areas of the manuscript that need to be improved before publication as they are too broad and undefined. Please see below for more specific comments.

Comments to be addressed:

Major compulsory

1. Methods - Overall the headings and subheadings need to be clearer and the text tightened.
   • Headings and subheadings have been made clearer and some of them tightened.

2. Methods/Study design / Quantitative data – How was the satisfaction measured. More information than ‘a multiple-choice questionnaire survey needs to be described. This needs to be described in text as well as in the table.
   • Indicators used in the satisfaction survey have been added in Table 3.

3. The variables that are being analysed should be listed in the methods so that the reader is prepared for the results. This could be expanded in this section with a list of variables in brackets after the ‘prevention practices’ and ‘mosquito screen project’.
   • The variables that are being analysed with the survey have been added in line 178 and in Table 3.

4. Results – overall the results section text needs to be tightened up. It is not clear what are the quantitative and qualitative sections of the survey results.
   • Aclaration regarding when the results come from the qualitative or the quantitative arm of the research have been done in lines 310, 313, 323, 440

5. Results. There is inconsistency in the way the different sub-sections/variables are presented. The FGDs seem to be described in some sections but not others. Only one or two quotes or specific examples (e.g. woman being robbed) presented which is inconsistent.
• 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”.

• Another quote from FGD has been added in line 295-297

Minor discretionary or essential

• Introduction/first paragraph – The word ‘catastrophically’ seems a strong word to describe economic impact
  Already changed in line 83

• Introduction/second paragraph – The used of the word ‘relaxed’ to describe methods is unusual.
  Already changed for “strongly” in line 83

• Introduction/third paragraph – LNs is not the standard abbreviation for long-lasting insecticidal nets and could cause confusion. LLINs would be more appropriate.
  • Every LNs has been replaced by LLINs

• Introduction/fifth paragraph - The phrase ‘little appetite’ could be replaced with ‘little incentive’
  • The word has been replaced in line106

• Methods/fourth paragraph – I don’t see why this paragraph is included and how it adds value to the paper. If the dangerous situation is justification for the smaller sample size, then I suggest that it is briefly mentioned there. If the study is about being in a dangerous area then it has to be made clear.
  • A brief commentary about how those circumstances were important for the study has been written in lines162-163.

• Methods / Quantitative data - The word ‘inputted’ could be replaced with ‘entered’ in line with the majority of other papers.
  • The word has been replaced in line 239

• Results/ first paragraph – Put the age range in.
  • Age range has been added in line 273

• Results/ Perspective of the preventative practices – It is not clear that there are two or more arms of the study involved. The sentence beginning with ‘Data collected in both arms of the study’ need to reworded, or a better description of the study needs to be inserted in the text in one of the above sections.
  • The description of the two research arms has been clarified in line 167-168.

• Results/Responsibility for dengue prevention - Broad statements such as ‘A strong feeling’ needs to be better quantified as this does not mean much without a reference scale, unless this was expresses during a FGD, if so it needs to be clarified.
  • It has been clarified in line 293.

• Figure 3. The quality of this figure is poor and needs to be redone.
• The figure has been redone.
• Recommendations It does not seem appropriate to put so much emphasis on control in ‘insecure urban settings’ when the focus of the study is not on this specifically, - although described periodically throughout.
• We have clarified how insecurity shapes vector control strategies and has shaped our study, we think it has to be taken into account.
• Recommendations. Is it know that the CSG’s would be effective?
• It has been recommended by many authors as well as international organizations as the reference in the paper points out.
• Other comments. The limitations of the study are not mentioned.

• Limitations of the study have been added in lines 529-535
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Review for BMC Public Health

Review of: Use and acceptance of long lasting insecticidal net screens for dengue prevention in Acapulco, Guerrero, Mexico

Overall: The article is very interesting – examining community’s perspective on a possible intervention for dengue prevention - and uses mixed methods to examine this subject, which is appropriate. The writing could be improved – it needs a good edit because there are sentences that could be shortened and parts that are somewhat awkward – but the topic and results kept me interested throughout. I felt the authors did a good job summarizing literature, presenting results (although it took me a while to understand presentation of results in Table 2), and discussing their results in the context of other literature.
Major Compulsory Revisions

There are three main areas that need improvement:

1) Detailed description of the intervention. This article is about people’s reaction to an intervention. It is assumed that we understand what the intervention was like. You need more on this – it is central to the article. What was given out??
   How many screens? Did your teams install them? Did you get a number ahead of time and then come with pre-made screens? Did your team make them and install them, or simply provide materials and expertise? Did you come back to observe that the screens had been fitted correctly?? We don’t know ANYTHING about how this was done, and yet it is central to this article.
   • Lines 116-121 and 123-125 have been added to explain better the intervention to address this lack of information.

2) Study design. Specifically, it would be very useful in this section to give us time frames (in fact, when was this data collected?) for the various research activities. For example, you tell the reader it is sequential, but what is the order? It seems you start with the quantitative – is that at the same time as the screen distribution or before or right after?? Then you do the intervention and then do focus groups afterwards because you have information about people’s experiences. But when the reader reads the manuscript, this is not clear – I am beginning to get a sense of study design as I read the results because I am seeing what type of data you obtained!! A small figure or some text that gives readers an idea of the order of events would help.
   • Lines 175 and 180 have been added to give the reader an idea of the time frames for the different arms of the study.

3) Presentation of quantitative findings. This article uses a mixed methods approach, and the results and discussion are very interesting. However, considering there are quantitative results, it seems that these are only mentioned in the passing in a few locations – there is not much “dedicated” to reporting them. Or maybe the “satisfaction survey” only had information about the state of the screens? (Maybe that could also be added in more detail in study design – what topics exactly were covered in the satisfaction survey?)
   • 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.

Minor Essential Revisions

Line 203: “in light of the current situation in Renacimiento” it was unrealistic to sample 746 households – what is that current situation?? The violence? However, you did reach all these houses for the intervention? “Therefore a quota of 373, half of the households, ….” Until now, you had a very systematic sampling approach, but then for this last part, it is unclear why you decided on that number… (see next comment)

Line 207-212 – fine explanation about quota design, but still does not explain what it was a “pragmatic compromise”. I feel the reader is left out of what is happening!
• Line 216 has been added to explain why a sample of 746 households was unrealistic.

Line 241: So how did you all code? You read through everything, then developed codes, then started coding? What was this process like?
• Line 254-259 have been added to explain the coding process.

Line 245: “data from the quantitative surveys were added to the CHARTED qualitative data…” - what is the charted qualitative data?
• See added lines 254-259.

Line 318: since you present your qualitative and quantitative data together, it would be useful to the reader to get some numbers here. These are very good (and interesting) reasons for rejection, but how many rejections did you have? Those numbers would be very useful right here (as well as in the reasons for accepting).
• Numbers of rejections have been included in lines 213 and 335.

Line 399-400: Screen survey: So when was this survey conducted? As part of the satisfaction survey?? (This relates to the comment in major compulsory revisions about needing more detail about the study design.)
• Clarification about the screen survey has been addressed in line 176.

Table 2: it took me a while to understand it. Consider other ways to present this data.
• New table created.

Discretionary revisions

Awkward phrasing in the abstract (line 33-34): “… study in Acapulco, Mexico, districts of which have exceptionally high levels of crime…” Maybe reword to “study in various districts of Acapulco, Mexico, with exceptionally high levels of crime…”??
• Already reworded in Lines 36-37

Line 83: separate Ae. from aegypti (here and everywhere else)
• Already done in Line 86 and everywhere else

Line 85: remove comma after LNs (the one before the word stop)
• Already done in Line 88

Line 145: don’t start sentence with a number – write it out
• Already done in Line 154

Line 156 -15: Please rewrite this entire sentence – particularly starting at “to produce generalizable, categorical data describing the community’s practices and satisfaction [practices on what? Satisfaction towards what??], and to deeply explore [remove deeply] and contextualize different perspectives held within the community.” Or maybe simply cut that sentence. The latter half is vague and
unclear.

- Already rewritten in Line 169-170

Line 163-166: Needs editing. You have two “study” words in the first part of that sentence and it is redundant and wordy the way it is. Also, no need for “questionnaire survey” – choose one. Replace first sentence to something like: “Quantitative data was obtained from a multiple choice survey.” Next, is the “satisfaction survey” part of the entire survey or is that the name of your survey? It is the first time it comes up and a bit confusing. And when you say it focused in “greater detail”, it makes me think that there is another survey that covered the topic of dengue prevention, but then this one went into more detail??? It is confusing.

- Re-edited in lines 175-178

Line 170: Wordy first sentence.

- We think the sentence is correct and understandable.

Line 175: remove the parentheses around “school teachers… screens.”

- Already done in line 190

Line 196: remove “a” from in front of “100”

- Already done in line 209

Line 197-200 (and anywhere else): do not start sentence with numbers

- It’s been done in lines: 205, 206, 207, 266,276, 395,291,

Line 229: “satisfaction questionnaire” – be consistent with survey or questionnaire.

- Questionnaire has been replaced by survey in line 237, 266, 230 in order to achieve consistency.

Line 282: FDG should be FGD

- Already done in line 293

Line 287: Overall satisfaction with dengue prevention efforts was high – I take it this is in reference to government related efforts?

- Aclarartion already done in Line 299

Line 290: Awkward word choice for the title. Maybe: Perspectives about the screens? Or: Experiences with the screens?

- Already changed to “Perspectives about the screens” in line 305

Line 300: only “discovered” maybe, instead of “discovering” – slightly awkward…

- We would like to emphasize that it was happening during the FGD.

Line 307: “opinions of” should be “opinions about”

- Already changed in line 322

Line 322-329: I understand you are trying to remain as loyal as possible to the
transcript, and it is great to have some quotes (I think these are the only two in the entire paper), but I would clean them a little more so that they are easier to read…

- Already cleaned in lines 337-344

Line 355: “… and was the most common grievance with the project.” What was the most common grievance with the project? The installation?? This sentence is not clear.

- The most common grievance was the incomplete installation of the screens. The sentence has been rewritten to make clearer that.

Line 358-361: This sentence needs editing – long and awkward sentence!

- We reckon the sentence is ok

Line 449: “very FEW households had FEWER screens than originally…” -edit slightly to make this sentence easier to read.

- Already done in line 464

Table 1: very useful
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