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Reviewer's report:

The study indicates a number of interesting and valuable insights into the realities of wheelchair service provision in Kenya and the Philippines. However, a number of revisions are outlined below.

TITLE:

To emphasize the study sample of basic wheelchair users and the study aim of assessing access to wheelchair services, the study title could be revised to "Perspectives of basic wheelchair users on improving their access to wheelchair services in Kenya and Philippines: a qualitative study”.

BACKGROUND:

- To provide a comparison in global terms of disability rates, include a sentence outlining how the disability rates of 4.6% for Kenya and 1.41% for Manila are below that outlined in the World Report on Disability of approximately 15% of the world's population.

METHODS:

- Please outline a rationale for why the study locations of Kenya and the Philippines were selected.

- The manuscript states that "Study participants were a subset of participants in a survey of 852 wheelchair users in Kenya and the Philippines conducted between December 2014 and February March 2015. The methods of the survey have been described in detail elsewhere [16].” However, it does not provide sufficient information about how this qualitative data fits into this study. Why is only the qualitative data presented here?

- Please explicitly outline why a differentiation was made between participants greater and less than 45 years of age.
- The reader could benefit from inclusion in the manuscript of the interview guide used.

RESULTS:

- The manuscript states that "In both countries, the sample was evenly divided by gender and being currently married or not". However, 63% of the Kenyan sample reported never being married or being currently divorced - please revise this statement.

- More supporting evidence is needed across categories. For example, findings categorized under 'Prescription or selection, funding and ordering' require supporting quotes.

- All quotes need to include more information regarding their source (such as both nationality and age), if possible to do so without compromising anonymity, so that it is transparent if findings represent a variety of participants or a small number of dominant participants.

- Please explain why Steps 1 and 2 and Steps 3 and 4 are combined while other steps are outlined separately. Step 5 is also omitted.

DISCUSSION

Editing is needed to correct grammatical errors throughout the article, and to ensure that concepts are presented clearly. For example, the Discussion section includes statements that could be clearer such as "Well-timed services sometimes facilitated the process of obtaining an appropriate wheelchair" and "The qualitative study findings complement the findings of the quantitative survey, which found that elements of service delivery were associated improved functioning in both countries [16]". To illustrate further, the Discussion section outlines that the qualitative data "demonstrated contextual factors that could affect the findings of future studies but are difficult to measure in a survey, such as having peer support, an enabling social and policy environment, and reduced stigma". However, the policy environment is not mentioned throughout the article. Therefore, please ensure that clear statements based on the findings are presented.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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