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Reviewer's report:

Abstract
Line 6. Eight focus group discussions were conducted in this study. Was this number enough for data saturation?

Line 9. Unsafe water. Did you collect respondent’s perceptions on “safe water”? What do they understand or perceive about safe water? Sometimes people think that clean water is safe water as there is no dirt visible. However, there might be a knowledge gap regarding this issue and awareness raising is required.

Line 10. Factors influencing. These factors could be facilitating or impeding towards acceptance and sustainability of any intervention. Both factors should be reported to describe the situation.

Line 13-14. Meaning of this sentence is not clear.

Background
Page 4, line 13. A tremendous decline in under-five mortality, but the author did not mention the proportion which was required?

Page 5, line 12. Water quality intervention. Describe briefly on type of interventions in background section, its maintenance, cost and payment by the community, any management committee, etc. Research gap of the study is not clear. What are the challenges mentioned in other researches in different parts of the world or in India? Where do you want to make difference and why?

Overall, background section needs to be improved with some more information by explaining the context and significance of the topic.

Methods
Page 6, line 17. The current manuscript should be checked thoroughly for language and grammatical mistakes. For instance:

Page 6 and line 17, the meaning of this sentence is not clear. Does it mean that
intervention has been started or given at that time and data are collected through FGDs or interviews after 6 months of intervention?

Page 6, line 11. “their their” was typed twice.

Page 7, line 3. “A total of 8 FGDs, 6 FGDs………..” this sentence needs to be rephrased to make the reader more clear.

Page 7, line 1. What do you mean by “compliant and non-compliant household”? The author should explain it in the manuscript.

Page 7, line 16. “non-study village”. The author should change it by comparison village or control village. Similarly, “study village” should be written as intervention village.

Results

Page 9, line 23. “Mineral water”. What are the reasons of feeling such? Give some interpretations about such feeling.

Page 10, line 9-10. This quotation is confusing. The respondent is reporting about unsafe water but in their village water does not make anyone sick. Does the respondent mean that water in their village is safe and good for health?

Page 10, line 14. “Boiling was the most frequently reported method……………….” Boiling is the most frequently used method, but they are giving boiled water only to children and adults for drinking. It’s unclear. Isn’t it a bit costly method as it requires money to buy fuel or gas for boiling water? While some parents are concerned about saving in fuel (page 11, line 16).

Finally, it is required to give some hints earlier on the message while using the quotation.

Page 25, Table 3. The analysis can be organized like the following table indicating broad theme, sub-theme and issues explored under each sub-theme and can be described in data analysis section as the data are analyzed thematically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad theme</th>
<th>Sub-theme</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>…………..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>…………..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>…………..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>…………..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>…………..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>…………..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health outcome</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>…………..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>…………..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>…………..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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