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Reviewer's report:

I believe that this case study does not add much new knowledge to the literature on public health partnerships for those who have engaged in such partnerships all over the world. The themes raised in the interviews seem to be standard in any debate or discussion about partnerships between government agencies at the local and national levels. The limited number of interviews and the lack of voices from the communities affected by the programs are major weaknesses of the article, because it ended up addressing only management perspectives from different agencies. Although these voices are important, they do not represent how the population affected by the interventions felt or reacted to them. Thus, the article can hardly be regarded as reflecting partnerships based on community-based participatory research or community-engaged partnerships, though some of the literature cited in it comes from this area of research and practice. It appears that community organizations were not a major concern in the development of the partnerships or if they were, there was no mention to it in the article. This article is methodologically sound, though I would like to see a longer explanation of the OSOP technique.
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