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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Not sure - key details are missing from the manuscript

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Overall a really well written paper, describing an ambitious programme of work - specifically dealing with the implementation issues, which were clearly many. The authors did a good job of clearly describing this complexity and some of the steps taken to adapt, yet remain aligned with the study protocol. A key missing element is a description of why this was done given the comments on page 19 about differentiation and improvement on the existing programs (HPB and MoH). Given the unique nature of Singaporean structures, and noting the value in describing this work
in the detail provided, wondering how generalizable this work is to implementation research more broadly, especially as one strong take-away was that the success of the project relied heavily on individual personalities and cultural capital in "face-saving".

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
The authors do not provide an estimate for numbers of individuals needed to achieve saturation for each of the 4 FGD target groups, but in the discussion say that the target sample sizes were achieved. The background and discussion should include justification for undertaking this work - why this is better than or complementing the existing systems.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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