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Reviewer’s comments for manuscript titled:

Feasibility of implementing intermittent preventive treatment of pregnant women for malaria in private and public antenatal clinics in Tanzania: experience-based perspectives of health managers in Mkuranga and Mufindi districts

General
The report suggests that reviewers did not take time to review procedures for running of health services within the contexts of health reforms and decentralization at national and district levels. They will benefit by being abreast with procurement, financing and financial disbursement in that context.

Major
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The posed question was “this study was, thus conducted to assess the experience-based perspectives of health managers in two districts in Tanzania regarding the underlying factors for the effective implementation of IPTp services and measures that could help to improve the scaling up and coverage of pregnant women taking IPTp doses in the country”.
The authors should have concisely presented the operationalization of “effective implementation of IPTp, experience-based perspectives its measurement”. This would have made the study focused and aligned to the original ideas.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The study utilized qualitative methods FGD was applied in one district and IDI in the second district. The two data collection methods have different aims and consequently pooling data from the two methods may be unacceptable. Two different data collection methods are used together in triangulation. Otherwise they should justify the current presentation of the results as if it was collected using similar methods. It is possible some of the difference observed between districts is explained by the different methods used.

3. Are the data sound?
The study was to on “assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of national IPTp”
since the contexts was not set and the study problem was not conceptualized, otherwise the scope and limits of the study was not determined appriori. Consequently the results presented are not have a defined scope and touches on many issues which should have been out of the scope.

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

The authors present results and discuss them in sections. The sections do not posit its relevance to the research question; furthermore there is no distillation of significant findings from each narration presented in those sections. Consequently the findings of the study are not made explicit.

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

Discussion section is presented; do not have a paragraph summarizing the main findings. In addition the discussions section is more of collection of narration of a literature review.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

There is a statement on limitations but without a statement on how the results could be interpreted.

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

The authors mention of a bigger study within which this was conducted. There has to be a brief and clear description of this bigger project.

Minor.

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

Not easy to judge as the findings are not explicit.

2. Is the writing acceptable?

There several typographic and grammatical errors
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