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Reviewer’s report:

This paper could provide an important contribution to our understanding of Haiti’s health system specifically, however, I need some clarification on the research question and the methods to be able to better understand the study and its findings.

Major comments

1. The research question or problematic is unclear to me. What is a ‘severely disrupted environment’? Why study such an environment? What is a ‘market perspective’? (Just a reference for this last point might suffice).

2. The methods section is confusing.
   A. What is the research design of the global research project? Perhaps also include a short summary of the project, countries involved, etc and/or link to a reference where readers can get more info on the full study.
   B. What methods were used for the Haitian study - only interviews, there should be a statement that interviews were done prior to stating that a thematic guide for interviews was prepared. In the abstract it does not state that interviews were done, but rather reviews of documents - confusing. Also, what type of interviews were done? What tools were used? How were they validated? What languages were they prepared in? Overview of type of questions asked - possibly put the questions in an annex. How was the thematic guide modified for the Haitian context? Feasibility study?
   C. Why was only oral consent obtained? Please give rationale.
   D. Where did this study take place/where were the interviewees working in Haiti? This is very important in interpreting findings if the study was localized in Port-au-Prince versus across various departments.
   E. There needs to be a description of the sample.
   F. What type of data analysis was done?
   G. Data management processes should be described, including how participant information was protected.

3. I find the results section confusing as it is intertwined with the literature - can this section be rewritten to only include data from the study as well as providing supportive evidence of findings (e.g. direct quotations).
4. Study limitations?

Minor comments

1. In first para; the word different is used 4 times in the same sentence, consider revising.
2. What is 'ensekerite' - is this Creole - clarify.
3. Reference 15 does not demonstrate that there was a rise in chronic disease, given the data cited was cross-sectional.

Discretionary comments

1. Although the authors do describe the variety of factors that have shaped the role of the state and the poor health outcomes in Haiti, the authors are curiously silent on the historical role of US and the influence of neo-liberal policies on the Haitian health system, which this reviewer believes to be a critical issue for understanding the Haitian health system today.
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