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Reviewer's report:

General:
Business/private sector and governmental public health partnerships have not been well characterized in the literature. The article by JW Buehler et al. is a good effort to document and describe the processes, challenges, and successes of one effort to do just that. There use of a descriptive case study methodology highlighted key steps for other jurisdictions that will want to copy such a model. Although the concept of community partnerships has become standard within the context of public health and community preparedness, clear explanation of a working model has not been documented. The authors examined, characterized, and explained the efforts and practices of the GBF/BENS-public health partnership. This reader was curious to know the following:
• Has this group produced tools and documents that can be shared with other jurisdictions? If so, the paper could provide links to those or refer readers to a place for more information.
• Is there a reference the authors can provide for their statement about liability protections not extending to preparedness activities?

Comments on specific sections of the paper are listed below.

Title: Appropriate

Abstract: Clearly describes the research question, methods used, and the key findings and implications.

Introduction/Background: The authors’ central premise and other information are presented clearly and concisely. Relevant literature is also cited in detail. The authors’ descriptions are straightforward.

Methods & Analysis: All procedures and methods of analysis are described in detail and are appropriate to answer their research questions. The authors did a good job of helping the reader understand the methodology of the case study, justifying its use, and provided enough detail for other researchers to use this technique to conduct similar lines of inquiry.

Results: The data are presented well. This reader had no problems following the authors’ logic of presentation of their findings.

Additional documents: The additional document contained useful information – seeing the interview questions and a list of those interviewed is helpful.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached): No major revisions indicated.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct): Only minor revision is that on page 5, the correct "SNS City Readiness Initiative" to "Cities Readiness Initiative."
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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