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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.
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.
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’.
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.
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.

Minor discretionary or essential

1. Introduction/first paragraph – The word ‘catastrophically’ seems a strong word to describe economic impact
2. Introduction/second paragraph – The used of the word ‘relaxed’ to describe methods is unusual.
3. Introduction/third paragraph – LNs is not the standard abbreviation for long-lasting insecticidal nets and could cause confusion. LLINs would be more
4. Introduction/fifth paragraph - The phrase ‘little appetite’ could be replaced with ‘little incentive’

5. 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.

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

7. Results/ first paragraph – Put the age range in.

8. 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 be reworded, or a better description of the study needs to be inserted in the text in one of the above sections.

9. 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 expressed during a FGD, if so it needs to be clarified.

10. Figure 3. The quality of this figure is poor and needs to be redone.

11. 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.

12. Recommendations. Is it known that the CSG’s would be effective?

13. Other comments. The limitations of the study are not mentioned.
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