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1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

This is an important topic. I agree with the authors that networks are of growing importance in Public Health. In this regard the paper makes an important and innovative contribution to the body of knowledge.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

The methods are appropriate and generally well described. It might be useful to give the reader a sense as to the profiles and numbers of persons who participated in the FGDs. It is appropriate to request that the authors use a consistent abbreviation. I think the accepted terminology is Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and not FDG.

3. Are the data sound?

The data is sound and what would be expected in an investigation of this nature. The efforts to triangulate between FGDs, participant observations and surveys is appreciated.

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

The data are generally reported according to expected standards. However, some more clarity would help e.g., how the FGD participants from each organization were selected. Were the top managers automatically included? Other staff? On what basis were they considered knowledgeable to represent views of their organization? Was there homogeneity in the FGD participants?
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

The discussion and conclusion are generally well balanced and based on the data presented.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

Possible limitations of the work are indicated.

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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

This is a first description and documentation, follow up studies are planned. The authors cite relevant work on which their study is based.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

The title and abstract convey the contents found. However, it might be useful to make it clear, e.g., by inclusion in title, that this was a case study.

9. Is the writing acceptable?

The writing is acceptable. However, there are quite a number of typos and inappropriate phrases or word misspellings which will only be caught by a thorough proof reading by someone with spoken and written fluency in English used in Public Health. For example, ‘risk adverse’ should be ‘risk averse’, ‘brokeage’ was probably meant to be ‘brokerage’, ‘context factors’ should be ‘contextual factors’, ‘dame faith’ is ‘same faith’, etc.

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

See above.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

See above. ‘Figure 1’ looks like a table to me.

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

There are no major compulsory revisions.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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