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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for letting me review this interesting paper. I think it is an important subject to address. However, I think the manuscript needs some changes and elaborations. I have pointed out my comments below:

Major:

- The analysis is still immature; e.g., there are overlapping themes. I suggest you use more time on the analysis and condensate the main findings.

- The discussion would benefit of elaboration of the results from a theoretical point of view

- The paper needs language revision. Some sentences are too long, and some are a bit difficult to understand.

Minor:

Abstract:

- What is the difference between "group interview" and "focus group discussion"?

Introduction:

- Line 36: can you elaborate a little on PLA

- Line 56: can you elaborate a little on "ecological perspective."

Materials and methods

- Line 12: what is upazillas?

- Line 15: please spell out PE the first time, you mention it.
- The paragraph "setting" is long, and some of the information might be described in the "introduction" instead (line 43 and forward)

Data management and analysis
- Does your analysis method have a formal name?
- Reference 23 has a wrong spell for "learning."

Discussion
- The discussion could benefit from a short presentation of the main findings in the very beginning.

Conclusion:
- Line 19, what does "macro" refer to?

**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.

Unable to assess

**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:
Needs some language corrections before being published
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