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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The quality of the paper would improve if the research questions were to be presented in a more structured way. There are three different objectives, which this research addresses, but unfortunately they are lumped together in only one sentence; this makes it quite reader-unfriendly.

--> discretionary revision

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The method section could clearly improve.
I miss a clear-cut description of the qualitative methodology applied; it is mentioned that FGDs and key informant interviews were taken, but these are mere data collection techniques and do not explain the underlying methodological approach.
As with quantitative studies, scientific rigor should be applied and it should be clearly stated which methodological approach was taken.
In addition, it is not clear why two types of data provision sources were used. Which different kinds of data were assessed within these two groups?

How as the recruitment done for the FGD?
The number of FGDs was quite low, as was the number of participants in the FGDs? Why was this the case (this is clearly a limitation of the study, which, however, is not mentioned anywhere).
Where the FGDs stopped because of saturation of data, or just because of limited resources?

--> Major Compulsory Revisions

3. Are the data sound?
Data seem to be sound, however the methodological approach of data analysis taken is not being described (see also the comment above).
It is not being mentioned if any measures to safeguard accuracy when translating the data assessment tools (i.e. topic guides) and the data as such (i.e. transcripts), were in place.
Major Compulsory Revision

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

It could improve a lot considering my remarks above on the missing scientific rigor and necessary and transparent reporting standards of qualitative data.

Major Compulsory Revision

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

The discussion is well written and shows in how far the findings of this study are coherent with previous findings in the literature. However, it is difficult to understand how the author has developed the explanatory model (see also the figure); while the text mostly talks about individual explanations of root causes of hypertension, in the figure this is summarized as a general model derived from the research. However, the methodological approach of this induction is not explained.

The discussion section does not address sufficiently what the most relevant findings of this study are in addition to what is already known about the problem.

Major Compulsory Revision

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

No. No section in study limitations is being provided.

Major Compulsory Revision

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

Yes, but no use of health seeking behavioural theories and behaviour change theories is being made.

Major Compulsory Revision

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey

Yes.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.