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Reviewer’s report:

Page 4, line 15:

It would have been interesting to see sustainability not just as a phase but as a continuous action and taking into account all the intervention, not just its "aftermath".

See:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/222928496_Program_Sustainability_Begins_with_First_Events

https://implementationscience.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1748-5908-8-117

Page 6, line 3:

Was the conference call part of the data collection? if yes, can it be more defined? (who took part, when, was it part of the trainers' survey or the sustainability phone interviews?)

Page 6, line 18:

Are the "1 to 3 calls" attempts to call? or number of participants? (was there not 1 to 8 participants/initiatives?)

Page 7, line 35:

Participants are the "initiatives representatives"? or the larger group of 37 participants?

Page 8, 1st paragraph:

I assume the sustainability outcomes were perceptions by the participants, it would therefore be important to specify it. Was there any document used to triangulate the information? if so, it would be interesting to add this in the methodology/results.

Page 9, line 18:
Was there a specific definition of sustainment and its different levels? or was it based again on personal conceptions?

See:


and 2 examples (in french though...)

https://www.cairn.info/revue-tiers-monde-2013-3-page-73.htm (paragraphs 10 & 13)


Page 18, line 65:

Is there an explication of why some initiatives reported financial support as a lesser barrier? Was it because they had more financial support then others?

General:

- There is no discussion on how the methodology employed could have influenced the results: phone + online interviews, snow-ball data collection. Can there be a possibility of overestimating the results due to these methods (no face-to-face confrontation or sampling bias of the snow-ball methods)? Could this also explain the variations between the interviewers' and initiatives' ratings?

- Again, is there a possibility that participants gave good accounts of the initiatives because it looked like an evaluation? Is there room for a reflexive thought?

- In the Methodology section, since there are different participants for different data collection processes, to integrate the "participants and procedures" section within the "Measures" section wouldn't make it clearer and less redundant?

- Since it is a mixed-method study, it would be interesting to integrate more the qualitative with the quantitative data. Eg.: Clearer analysis processes, a rational why mixed-method was used (since the quantitative side is a bit weaker via its few participants), the limitations of this methods, etc.

See:

- A better description of the context(s) of the initiatives would be interesting and would enable more transferability of the study. Many criteria are however there in the study, which is very good (Qualitative approach, reflexivity, etc.).

See:


- Very interesting article that confirms many other studies (that could have been in the discussion), with many aspects that will now have to be further explored.

(pdf version of the referred articles are joined to the review)

**Level of interest**
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

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

Needs some language corrections before being published

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal