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**Reviewer’s report:**

I think the paper is fine with relevant findings. I have used some of these findings already in the last week to emphasize these lessons learned while on mission in another country in Africa.

In a revision, the authors may want to improve the abstract and consider the following MINOR points which are mainly methodological (as the helpfulness of the results speaks for itself).

**ABSTRACT**

1. I think the all-important conclusion of the abstract is a bit boring. The conclusion and background paragraph of the abstract are almost the same. The golden nuggets of wisdom within the article do not shine through the abstract.

**INTRO**

2. The intro of the paper should explain what are level 1, 2 and 3 etc of the health system as the reader is expected to know it

**METHOD**

3. I am not quite clear how many people (and how many men and women) were in each of the 4 focus groups, whether all participants were in more than 1 of the 4 focus groups, to what extent where the focus groups mixed (eg both from intervention and control group together or separate; mix of doctors and nurses? Men and women mixed?).

4. Were all named “exploratory questions” (see p 6) asked? That is a lot of questions for a 90 minute focus group!

5. How did the authors decide that 4 focus groups was enough? Textbooks on qualitative research would suggest that one would need to continue doing focus groups until there is “data saturation”

**RESULTS**

6. Did the researchers notice differences between intervention and control group in terms of responses in focus groups? Or is this an answer that this methodology could not answer (eg too small sample)?
DISCUSSION

7. In the discussion, it would be great if the authors could reflect on their focus group questions. If they would do similar focus groups elsewhere, would they ask the same questions? Are there any questions that could be dropped or any one’s that could be sharpened or should be added? This will help other researchers in the future. Indeed, quite a few of the questions asked did not have a response reflected in the discussion.

8. In the discussion, it would be great if the authors could reflect on the pros and cons of taping the interviews. Would they tape interviews again in the future if they were to do the research is again?
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