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Author’s response to reviews:

Response letter

Reviewer reports:

Shafika Abrahams-Gessel, DrPH (Reviewer 1): I was glad to have an opportunity to review this paper as the topic is very important in implementation science. Overall, the paper is well written with hypotheses clearly stated and conclusions drawn are appropriate.

One minor recommendation is that the authors may want to add a sentence or two to their Discussion section noting their opinions about the potential impact of the use of the official language (Russian) versus the local language (Ukrainian) on missing data especially. I recognize that Russian is widely spoken and do not contend that performing the data collection in Russian is a detractor. Rather, I believe that the authors' insights on any impact due to the difference in official versus locally spoken languages would be useful to researchers engaged in implementation and scaling work in other LMIC where the official language is often not as
accessible, or widely used, as the local language by the populations of interest, and has the potential to impact not only data collection but the measures being used.

The authors may also consider including their vignettes, qualitative, and quantitative data collection instruments as a supplement for readers who are not as familiar with analysis with questionnaire design and factor analysis.

Author Response:

We thank the reviewer for his comments. Regarding the language issue – we understand that his concern is our use of the official language rather than the local language and that this choice of the language that is less widely spoken locally may have made it difficult for some people to respond, resulting in missing data. However, the reviewer has misread the paper. On page 7, under Vignette Development, we explain that we did the opposite and in fact chose the locally more widely spoken Russian language rather than the official Ukrainian language. We did this because we had exactly the same concerns as the reviewer has stated. Since this is an error in reading and does not reflect the concerns of the reviewer we feel no change is needed.

We appreciate the reviewer’s suggestion to include our vignettes and instruments as a supplement and have attached them to our submission.