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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.

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.

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?)

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 241: So how did you all code? You read through everything, then developed codes, then started coding? What was this process like?

Line 245: “data from the quantitative surveys were added to the CHARTED qualitative data…” - what is the charted qualitative data?

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).

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.)

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

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…”??

Line 83: separate Ae. from aegypti (here and everywhere else)

Line 85: remove comma after LNs (the one before the word stop)

Line 145: don’t start sentence with a number – write it out
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.

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.

Line 170: Wordy first sentence.

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

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

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

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

Line 282: FDG should be FGD

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

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

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

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

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…

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.

Line 358-361: This sentence needs editing – long and awkward sentence!
Line 449: “very FEW households had FEWER screens than originally…” -edit slightly to make this sentence easier to read.

Table 1: very useful
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