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Reviewer's report:

This was rather a difficult article to review as I wasn't entirely sure of the article type and the requirements for such. At times it read as a review article and at times as an opinion piece, was described as a debate article, and included just an introduction and then discussion.

Generally:

I think it is perhaps most valuable as a review article to assess the current state of programmatic knowledge - approaches and methods and outcomes - regarding interventions to reduce health condition related stigma in health facilities.

More specifically:

- I think it needs to be clear throughout and from the outset that what you are referring to is health condition related stigma

- I think the intro would better read using the following structure - what stigma is? what is health condition-related stigma? how does it manifest? what are the consequences?

- I think you need a methods and results section

- In terms of what you claim:

  - First, we make a case for commonalities between condition-specific stigmas (I don't think this is valid, I think it is just opinion). The preceeding section involves reporting a lot of 'mays', rather than literature and does not support the hypothesis

  - I think the results should be presented as a summary of each of the identified studies in terms of health-condition focus, approach, methods, outcome
I think the rationale for what is needed in terms of stigma reduction interventions needs to be in the introduction and then these things identified in respect of the studies through the review and then the gaps identified based on the review.

I query the conclusion that finding synergies for stigma-reduction across conditions is a good approach - my understanding of the latest literature regarding stigma reduction interventions is that they need to be more tailored in terms of both the message and the method.

**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.

Not applicable

**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:

Acceptable
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