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Reviewers comments:

Overall relevance: The article describes an iterative approach of using qualitative investigation to address sanitation challenges in an urban centre in a developing country. It therefore provides a good learning example for other cities faced with similar challenges.

Comments

Materials and Methods:

Page 10 line 17: The authors report that collected data was used to design materials for a pilot intervention. It is not clear how this was achieved. What strategy was used to prioritise the specific materials and interventions for piloting?

Page 10, line 26: The authors developed BCC materials to discourage waste disposal in toilets. It would be helpful to give more details on what type of materials were developed (audio messages, posters, videos, etc) and what could have influenced this choice?

Page 10, line 33: focus group discussions were conducted separately for both males and females. However, they were both mixed with landlords. Could this have influenced the discussions? This choice should be justified. Also, a focus group discussion was conducted with "children". It's not clear how many these were and how they were selected. More importantly, the authors should clarify whether and how the consent process for the participating children was handled.

Data Analysis

Page 11, line 31: It is not clear what the authors mean by "manually analysed". How do the results presented relate to the collected data? Was there identification of themes in the study? How well did the collected data fit within the IBM-WASH model used in the study?

Was the analysis process validated?
General comment on data management and analysis: The authors could highlight on how their relationship with the studied community, their own professional and personal experiences, or cultural differences could have affected their interpretation and design of the intervention. For instance, who coded the data, who analysed the data? And what experiences do these bring to the entire process?

Ethical considerations.

Line 52. The second sentence does not read well. Please check

Conclusions

General comment: The conclusions should be summarised further highlighting the most important messages from the article in at most 2 paragraphs. The study limitations could be included and discussed under the discussion section.

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.

Yes

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:
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