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Reviewer's report:

This is an important article and attempt to develop a model for awareness raising campaigns. As it stands now, the main points get a bit lost in the weeds. Moving forward, I recommend minor revisions (outlined below) to make this suitable for publication. Most significantly, the introduction and abstract should be reworked to reflect the main body of the paper (the empirical development of a framework for awareness raising). The language in the introduction and background are too far abstracted from the other material. The authors acknowledge the limitations of their methods and sample, but do not analyze these in a nuanced way. I would appreciate additional information on the specific campaigns and actions that are being assessed. As someone who has worked in the world of global health networks, I appreciate the aim of this paper and the clear need for tools to assess impact of collaborative work. With a stronger grounding in the RMCGC network activities, this paper will make an important contribution.

- P. 14/15 the methods section says that there are 19 influencers who were interviewed, but the rest of the paper uses n=20. This needs to be resolved.

- Which theory of change is this framework using? In the lit review, other efforts are criticized for a lack of clear theories of change, but the one for this framework needs to be more central.

- P.2/10 "raising the salience of the issues" --awkward phrasing (this is used a few times throughout the paper. Much like "scanning" rather than 'reviewing' literature, more precise language would help)/

- P.4-6 More information on RMC Global Council would strengthen the background. It just jumps into assuming the reader is familiar with this group. How was it formed? Who is the funder? Examples of other networks that are being referred to?

- P. 6 This is an excellent justification for the process of determining network impact. However, the next page muddies the water by failing to explicate contribution over attribution. Where did the idea of a "tracer" indicator come from?
- Box number 2 is unwieldy. It is too wordy to be helpful. Either break the text into bullet points, or get rid of the box and describe the content in the text.

- What are the implications of the unbalanced sample? How would you include more "influenced" individuals in the future?

- Please describe the snowball sampling process in more detail.

- The discussion starts to tease apart issues with assessing individual vs. network impacts, but I would appreciate more of this. Members of academic networks are still frequently assessed based on their individual contributions; is there a way to think about collective impact assessment benefitting individual members? How can this be reported in an academic setting?

- The significance of language came up in several places. There is a tension between the need for a shared lexicon in RMC and locally tailored materials for awareness raising. I'd like to see this dealt with in more depth. How can future campaigns navigate this tension?
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