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Reviewer's report:

My definitive opinion is that this article possesses both strengths and weaknesses. On the one hand, I see the value of a stringently derived procedure to a behavior change campaign. On the other hand, I find it difficult to identify the scientific contribution of this article. Applying the BCD approach to a concrete case is certainly interesting; however, the question is what the scientific value of this may be. What empirical findings does this article offer? From my point of view, most scientific work rests on some kind of comparison: before-after, intervention-control, etc., but in this article I do not find any comparison. The authors could compare their approach to other behavior change approaches and explain why their approach works better. They could present an evaluation demonstrating that it is better. Or they could elaborate the difference from a 'business as usual' approach that NGOs normally use.

I leave it to the editor to judge whether this article is worth for publication in BMC Public Health or not.

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

Unable to assess

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

Unable to assess

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

Unable to assess
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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