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Reviewer’s report:

This is an excellent and interesting paper that is generally well written and executed. While the objectives of the work are relatively modest, the authors are, nevertheless, able to make a significant contribution to the literature that many future readers will appreciate. I only have some minor editing requests to make.

Minor Essential Revisions

1) ABSTRACT: Spell out HTA when it first appears in the abstract and when it first appears in the paper

2) Page 6: The phrase “snow-balling from the initial interviews” is confusing and somewhat colloquial. I recommend using a word like “referrals”

3) Page 7: “previously [17] The” a period is missing

4) Page 8: “These latter tie-ups were”

   What does “tie-up” mean in this context? Is this a reference to contracts? I suggest rewording to clarify

5) Page 12: “This phenomenon has seriously impacted these firms’ human resources in a negative way.”

   This phrase is too vague and colloquial. Please reword and perhaps be more specific

6) Page 15: The first time you use any acronym (MNC and S&T on this page) please spell out the meaning. The appendix with the abbreviations is helpful but not as helpful as spelling it out on first usage. It is best not to use any acronyms in section headings, for those readers that are very quickly skimming the text.

7) Page 15: “located in the EU”

   Please replace with Europe for clarity.

8) Page 15: “require ‘reverse outsourcing’ to the West”

   From the context, I can deduce what reverse outsourcing is referring to. However, the phrase is not clear. This sentence should be reworded to avoid the use of novel jargon.

9) Page 16: “It turns out that the companies’ international reach”
The phrase “it turns out” is colloquial and unnecessary in this sentence.

10) Page 16: “Indeed, rather than via direct sales to the government, the companies have accessed,
This sentence is not clear. Can it be broken into several smaller sentences?

11) Page 17: “and (iv) ‘deskilling’ the product”
The word “deskilling” is not a common turn in public health discourse. The common term is “task shifting.” Rather than alienating a potential audience, I recommend rewording this sentence to say that the equipment should be explicitly designed to facilitate task shifting to lower cadres of worker.

12) Page 18: “firms need to do a trade-off between”
This phrase is unnecessarily colloquial. I suggest using a word phrase like “must consider both”

13) Page 18: “as well as novel regulatory mechanisms that ensure doctors’ adherence to them”
I did not see interview data to support this use of regulatory mechanisms to insure doctor’s adherence. It seemed like the companies were more interested in making sure physicians were educated about the latest techniques, not forced to adhere to them. Please support this statement or modify it to match the data.

14) Page 19: “scientific and medical agencies including councils and national scientific committees needs to become a new paradigm of their functioning.”
This phrase is not clear and may not be correct.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**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.

**Declaration of competing interests:**
'I declare that I have no competing interests'