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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your revision and serious work. I am generally happy with the revisions and believe that the manuscript is now close to being acceptable for publication.

As pointed out by the other reviewer, there are probably two papers in one, but the two arguments are clear to me. There are, still, a few minor issues to address before the manuscript is ready for publication:

Another close check of the quality of written English is necessary, especially for the sections that were modified.

The abstract also needs serious attention. Remember that most people will only read this part of the paper. Among others, please consider the following issues:

- Very first sentence of background: shouldn't it be "increased availability"? You are looking at changes, aren't you?

- Second sentence: why does it "need" to be taken into account? Shouldn't it be a proposition -that taking it into account may improve outcome- rather than a statement.

- "the latter prefer" sounds a bit convoluted, replace with "who"?

- Conclusion: you need to provide examples of community participation. I agree with the first reviewer about the community participation/mobilization distinction, but without more details, "participation" remains too vague a concept to be useful.
The conclusion also needs, I believe, some minor tweaks:

- "lack of capacity" - what do you mean? It would be useful to explain the capacities you are talking.

- "Fora should worth w"? What is w?

- Explain the possible participatory approaches.

Some minor, but nonetheless important, points:

p. 2: you don't need to repeat reference 11 again and again. One time should be enough.

p. 9: Catholics + Protestants is almost everybody in the countryside, so this category is not too useful. It could be useful to disaggregate between different types of protestants, in particular Baptists, Anglicans, Adventists, and Pentecostal. Each has a different attitude.

p. 12: I would suggest that loudspeaking and gossiping are two different paragraphs, and maybe even two different sections. They are, conceptually, very different things.

p. 14: "two years prior the current situation" will not be terribly meaningful in the future and is already a bit unclear. Maybe you could qualify the current situation, and replace it with: "two years before the political crisis that started in 2015" or something like that.

p. 18: what is the Mainwana project? Please explain.

p. 19: Explain what was the participatory approach in [48]. Eritrea instead of Erythrea.

p. 19: How can one judge whether the approach is successful. It would be useful to indicate indications about the "measures of success".

p. 19: "the transferability, horizontally and/or vertically" - please clarify.

p. 19: why were women shy and reluctant? Is this something that could be addressed with different methods?
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