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Reviewer’s report:

Minor essential revisions:

General comments:
Introduction – I would suggest that the authors consider discussing the Sustainable Development Goals 2015 and how this may or may not encourage or enhance integration of these two programs.

Method and results suggested edits: Starting on line 108 – need a little bit more detail on how these individuals were identified - through their work with organizations, on publications, etc. It is unclear if these were personal contacts or if they were identified through organizations in a more systematic way.

Also, more details needs to be provided on analysis performed on the interviews. How was coding performed to identify themes. Did anyone else review the coding? More details about this approach are important to include.

Also when quotes are shown in the results, please indicate the respondent with some type of identification (such as R1). This is common practice and would not necessarily allow for identification of the participant. It will, however, allow for identification of how often the respondents quotes were being used.

Discussion and recommendations:
I would like to see more detail in terms of the recommendations. For example, this sentences that starts on line 562 “Further operational research is needed to determine which WASH interventions are best suited for implementation for the specific WASH-related NTDs. It is recommended that both governments and donors prioritize funding for integrated programs and foster an enabling environment for integration.”

This is a very general recommendation and I think more thought needs to be put into what should be prioritized first – operational research and then funding for integrated programs – is that the order in which the authors believes this can and will proceed? Does one need to be available first in order for the second to be achieved?

Lastly, are there other fields from which similar program integration has occurred and this could be used to think about the way forward for integrating these two
More specific edits:
In general, my preference would be to use passive voice when describe data in tables. For example, on line 80. Instead of using Table 1 shows, I would suggest “As shown in Table 1…” I would suggest this editing this throughout the manuscript.

Specific comments:
Line 67 – dollars should not be capitalized
Footnote (found in line 68) at bottom of page 5 is cut off – only 10 countries listed on footnote 1.
Starting on line 145: The two sentences seems to same very similar things. I might suggest combining or removing one.
Line 455 (citations needed at end of the sentence – reference the work that describes this momentum.)
Sentence starting at 481 needs rephrasing.
Sentence starting on line 504 is better as two sentences.
I do not see a figure in the manuscript although it was mentioned in the text on line 87.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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