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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory.
I was delighted to see that the authors have rewritten and resubmitted this paper. It is much more focused and informative. However this means that I am regarding it in many ways as a new submission and there are some aspects that could be improved before publication.

Abstract. Some of the language in the first paragraph is awkward ‘This paper focuses on…..’
It was not clear where the ‘Five major attributes of mRDT acceptance’ came from this did not relate to either result, discussion or conclusion
‘One barrier was….’ This sentence is confusing as you might have or +ve or –ve result from the mRDT

Background. Pg 3
This was a better introduction to this newly written paper. However I think that it would benefit from further work. Given the setting of the research I think that following references 4 & 5 there should be something about introducing new technologies into a low resource setting. This might be a similar test, perhaps early use of rapid diagnostics in for HIV testing. It would also be relevant to cite any existing similar research into the use of mRDT in other low resource setting, in SSA or elsewhere. What was done and the results. Again focusing on the introduction of the new technology.
‘Previous reports proposed some factors….. ‘ this sentence needs referencing .

Page 4
‘In late 2006….’ The first sentence is rather awkward and could be phrased better. The 2nd half of the paragraph is confusing. You need to be very clear of the timeline of events and changes in policies. At present it is not clear and appears to contradict page 6

Page 6.
‘A cross sectional descriptive design was used’ this needs improving, to better describe what you have done.

Conceptual framework pg 10. This was interesting to see again and it has more relevance to this paper than the first submission. However you do not use it or refer to it again in either the results, discussion of conclusion. I suggest that you
either integrate it or cut it out. If you do keep it then ‘these key factors were adapted from previous work’… Needs a reference.

Pag 12 ‘health workers did not know the researchers, the objectives….’ I think you are trying to say that though the health workers knew that attendee’s in the health centres were being asked questions about mRDT they were not involved in the process.

Pg 14 Data analysis. This paragraph is confusing. You might rework it into three sections

You appear to have two sets of surveys (health worker and attendees). Each contained both quantitative and qualitative data (describe this)

The qualitative data was dealt with and analysed in the following manner…… (include references to justify and support your chosen method)

The quantitative data was dealt with and analysed in the following manner…… (did you use any statistical tests? If not say why and how you have used the data to describe different aspects of the research)

It is best to present this section as simply and clearly as you can.

Results pg 14. In the previous section you say how you used the conceptual framework to help you understand or perhaps collate your results. This does not appear to be reflected in the results section as it stands.

Results 16 ‘Worryingly some health workers…….’ Can you explain to the reader the relevance of the this comment.

Pg 17 Policy and treatment . You have two pieces of writing here in italicises are these quotes that need references or findings from health workers that need identifications? Same on page 18

Page 21 last half of the page.

I thought these results were very worrying and was surprised that there was not more mention of them in the discussion. Are the health workers making a decion that the tes is inaccurate if its negative and so they should treat anyway. Or are they treating negative cases because of community and patient expectations, or both?. Both of which are very important findings.

Discussion pg 24. I felt that this was rather short and superficial. You have some very interesting findings and I think that you can and should explore them further. I would expect you to refer to some relevant literature and reflect on your findings. You have done within the 2nd paragraph relating to patient expectations but this is not your only finding.

Also you should not be afraid to present your full range of findings, you are not hear to endorse the use of mRDT’s but rather to critically analyse what can be learnt from their introduction.

Page 25 Fig 3 is correct but file is labelled Fig 4.

**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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