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Author’s response to reviews:

REPH-D-17-00181: Applying the Results Based Management framework to the CERCA multi-component project in sexual and reproductive health care: a retrospective analysis

Responses to the reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1: A well articulate analysis using the RBM that could help improving multi-country implementation (operational) research in Latin America. There are clear lessons learned the authors have included that could help improving similar research initiatives. In terms of the relevance for publishing the article, it may be relevant to include implementation research as one of the key words as it may be relevant to professionals working on this field.

Response: Thank you for your complimentary comment.

We added in key words implementation research.

Reviewer #2:

General overview

* Enjoyable paper to read through. Very important piece of work. The background and discussions are well written and well argued. Just a few sentences need to be reframed, but well done.
* The abstract loses the audience a bit (see comments below).
* Methods and results needs to some revisions

Response: Thank you for your complimentary comment.

We have carefully reviewed the paper and made appropriate corrections/modifications to the text.

Abstract

Background: Diving into CERCA at the outset loses the audience. It also fails to capture why the audience should care about it.

* Reading through the body of the text, I hope if I understood correctly that the thrust of your message leans towards three things: 1) SRH problems such as adolescent pregnancy are complex and multifactorial, 2) Multi-faceted interventions are needed to address these complex multifactorial SRH problems, 3) But we need to know if these interventions work by evaluating their impact. Various impact evaluation methods exist- but your paper proposes RBM framework as best the framework with which to evaluate the impact such complex interventions- in this case using CERCA as your case study.

* If the above is true, just as a suggestion, then the background within the abstract at the outset would benefit from a few lines highlighting:
  
  o A line framing the problems SRH such as adolescent pregnancy as complex & multifactorial, which by their nature require multifaceted interventions? That evaluating the impact of such interventions is important (why?-cost, scalability etc). We propose RBM as the best approach using CERCA as a case study. CERCA was.(introduce CERCA here)…..

Response: Thank you for noting this. We have considered your suggestion and have made changes in all this section.

Plain English summary

* See highlights and comments within the body of the text.

Background

* Beautifully written
* See highlights and comments within the body of the text.

Response: We have considered your suggestion and have made the necessary changes in all this section.
Methods & Results

General comments:

* The method section is a bit thin on the list of documents and data sources. Do you have a table of all the documents and data sources reviewed (by country and category)? Which part of analysis used these documents?

* Within all the sub-sections of the results section, would it be possible to mention the data sources/documents from the outset? Eg number reviewed, what you found and report that in actual numbers?

Response: Thank you for noting this gap and for recommending a more detailed description of the documents used for this document. Documents were classified in the 3 main elements of RBM, planning, monitoring and evaluation. Each part was numbered according to the three key elements of planning, monitoring and evaluation. This table was inserted as an Appendix 1 in the method section.

Specific numbers reviewed for each country are displayed in table 1 and appendix 2.

* What is meant to be saved for the discussion section keeps coming up within the results section. The results sections needs to 'clear cut and cold' e.g. these are the documents we reviewed, this is what we found, this is what we could not find/ascertain?

Response: We agree to your suggestion and have made all necessary changes and eliminated some phrases.

* Do you have quotes from meeting minutes that you could add for instance? Anything else to support statements made in your findings?

* See highlights and comments within the body of the text.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have added two quotes to support the statements made in the text.

Discussion

* Well written. Need to rearrange a few paragraphs and reframe a few sentences

* See highlights and comments within the body of the text.

Response: We agree to your suggestion and have done changes according to highlights and comments that you did.

Response to additional comments within the body of the text:
The suggestion “add the tables to the body of the text”. We would like to thank you for this suggestion. They are in the text in the appropriate place now.

We modified the Appendix 1 as a Table 1 to the body of the text so it is visible and easy to read.

Most of your suggestions to improve the document were taken into account and the changes can be reviewed with track changes. Thank you for such a detailed work suggesting the improvements.