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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Editor,

Congratulations to the authors as the manuscript has greatly improved. There is a lot more clarity, and better flow. It is an easier and clearer read as compared to the last version. It is clear that a lot of hard work has gone into refining it. And so only a few more comments most of them minor.

Introduction

1. Where the authors refer to Pang et al.’s framework, it is left hanging with not much said about it with the assumption that either the readers already know about it or will look it up, both of which might not necessarily apply. Some more information would be valuable. If this is because of word limits, this could be placed in the appendix. (page 3)

2. Talking about McIntyre's framework, the third element talks about 'the taskforce' as though the reader should know this already. "Members of the task force including MoH", what task force? (page 3)

Methods

Something to clarify - what was the design - the conclusion section starts off with "This case study...........", this is the first time we are hearing about this being a case study. If for sure this is a case study, the authors may need to reflect this better in the methods section.

Results

Grammar and writing - for example:

a) Page 7, Paragraph 3, line 2: .................6 of them had 'taken', not 'took'

b) Page 7, Paragraph 4, line 2: Do not start a sentence with a numerical figure, write the number in words

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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