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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a very important study with a clear value added by focusing on 'influencers' and the 'influenced,' and by focusing on a particularly important part of campaigns (awareness-raising).

The comments below are intended to further strengthen this study. While the results offer some compelling insights, the methods and discussions section could be enhanced to fully establish the importance and uniqueness of this research.

**Specifics:**

P. 10-11, line 218-222: One particular challenge is that this is a single case study, so the authors could explain better the strengths of the single case. We already have comparative studies of health networks, so strategies and tactics have been captured and evaluated before. It may be useful to emphasize that this study highlights not just the establishment of a framework (they already exist), but can provide a more-in-depth understanding of a particular goal of a campaign (awareness-raising). While other studies look across campaigns broadly, this looks closely at a particular activity to offer more details. The study also stands out by doing what other don't do: compare answers by influencers and the influenced.

p. 11, line 230: The choice of frameworks seems a bit odd. The Spitfire makes sense since it was used by the campaign. However, please explain better why you needed Social Network Theory and FFEC. Neither of them were used by the campaign and the theory identified does not easily translate into a set of best practices. Also, there are other well-tested approaches similar to Spitfire that could be used to evaluate this campaign. Some are quite prominent:


It may be useful to explain a bit better why the combination of a scholarly theory, a hands-on guide, and a 'framework' was chosen (and not something else).
p. 13, line 270: I would suggest to ass the full interview guide as an appendix to the study. In this way, the readers understand the specific questions asked. For example, it would be interesting to see if the interview questions asked about all the categories in Table 1. It matters if an interviewee was specifically prompted to address an issue in the framework or not.

p. 14, line 286: As per the issue raised above, how did the authors determine that an issue was present (i.e. was there a specific question in the interview guide checking on it?)?

p. 15, line 308 and Table 2: what seems a bit out of place here is the second point. Four of the five points describe activities, while the second describes an outcome. I would re-think this and not make a result (awareness is attained) part of the framework that identifies factors for successful awareness raising. Capturing someone's attention is a result of the other factors.

Discussion: It may be useful to actually return to the analytical framework of this study, not just to Shiffman's work. Shiffman's work seems to be central to the study, but then it doesn't really appear to inform it in the design. In contrast, there are three sets of reading used to establish the framework (p. 11), but they are not being evaluated here. Considering the excellent results of this study, it may be useful to sell these better by making the discussion section more about how this study contributes and advances (challenges?) existing perspective.

p. 27: The conclusions are somewhat disappointing because the first point is not elaborated (what is there to learn?). On the second point, it may be useful to expand and say then why some campaigns fail at this goal or why awareness-raising may sometimes be problematic.


p. 30, line 634 (spelling): awareness-raising
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