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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)?
No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
No - there are minor issues

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:
The study is well-written, important and appears to be well-executed. The authors have explored an important and interesting topic and filled a gap in the literature. The study has a high number of participants for a qualitative study, which gives it great power and the methodological approach was well done. The results are important and make a contribution to the field. The methods the authors employ appear solid. There are some details in regard to research questions/purpose, methods, rigor and how the results are represented that need some attention and explication. Otherwise, the study appears to be technically sound.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
The following revisions are needed to improve this manuscript. First, there needs to be a section that
clearly identifies the research questions guiding the study and the purpose and aims of the research. Second, more details are needed that explain and describe the topics of the training the professionals underwent in the broader study. Perhaps a table would help. Third, likewise, more details about the total population from which the sample was drawn is needed. How many potential recruits were there? How representative is the sample from this broader pool? The authors also need to describe their recruitment methods including the stratification techniques they utilized. Fourth, information and details about the protocol and data collection measures (e.g. interview questions) need to be provided as well as how the interview guide was created and piloted. Fifth, there is not enough information/description and references that explain the analytic techniques (thematic analysis) and how rigor/trustworthiness was established and maintained (e.g. saturation, member checking, etc.). How were codes developed and themes generated? Why was thematic analysis chosen over other methods? Sixth, some of the results lack sufficient interpretation and description in the results such as patient record keeping, home visits, staff turnover, lack of private space for counseling, workload. This indicates to me that the sub-themes themes are too granular and that perhaps some of the sub-themes could be collapsed into larger categories. Otherwise, the authors need to provide more detailed description of some of these sub-themes as almost all of the sub-themes under the main themes of facilitators, barriers and strategies for improvement are too brief. Either collapse them or more broadly define each of the sub-themes. Lastly, a very thorough discussion section was provided, but I think the numbering approach (n=8) is unnecessary and some of the eight aspects mentioned by the authors could be collapsed into 5-6 broader areas that match the themes of the study (barriers, facilitators and solutions).

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
Not at this time.

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:
Acceptable
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