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Reviewer's report:

The paper is now very much improved. There are just a few issues for the authors to consider further.

A. METHODS

1) Second paragraph, second statement (page 5, line 137): Delete "women" after "results".

2) Second paragraph, last statement (page 5, line 141): Change "and reached 72" to "but successfully interviewed 72".

B. RESULTS

1) First paragraph (page 6, line 184): Change "the partner permission" to "the partner's permission".

2) Fifth paragraph under proposed facilitators, second statement (page 12, line 339): Delete "matter" from the statement.

3) Sixth paragraph under proposed facilitators, first statement (page 12, line 346): Change "to the community" to "in the community".

4) Framework: In spite of the changes, the framework still does not come out as explicitly as expected. The authors should create a separate section just before the discussion section where they explicitly talk about the framework in response to the issues that were previously raised (refer to previous comments regarding the framework). It is essentially helping the reader understand Figure 1. It is also in this section that the authors should specify that Figure 1 be inserted e.g. by using the phrase "Insert Figure 1 about here". Given that illustrations are submitted separately, this gives the editor a rough idea of where to insert the figure - which should be as close to the text that describes it as possible - should the paper be accepted for publication. In its current form, the framework presented in the figure is just floating somewhere without clarity of how and where it fits in the paper. There is no explicit text that describes what the figure is all about, including the elements that constitute it, how the findings feed into those elements, how the elements help us understand male involvement in cervical cancer programs, and how researchers can operationalize the elements for replication elsewhere. Although having read the paper multiple times I have a clear sense of how this should be written up, it
is up to the authors to help the reader understand their framework.

C. DISCUSSION

1) First paragraph, last statement (page 13, lines 373-375): Give a few examples of the ways being alluded to so that the statement is not left hanging the way it is in its current form.

2) Third paragraph, fourth statement (page 14, line 391): Change "increase in post-treatment care adherence" to "increase in adherence to post-treatment care".

D. ABSTRACT

Results, last statement (page 2, lines 65-67): Rephrase the second part of this statement to read: "in a setting where such leaders may hold influence over men in the community" as earlier suggested to avoid unnecessary repetition of the word "community" in the statement.

E. DECLARATIONS

Authors contributions:
* First statement (page 17, line 477): Delete "assisted with" from the statement.
* Last statement (page 17, lines 477-480): Delete "of" between "approved" and "the".
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