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Reviewer’s report:

This is a well-written, worthwhile and interesting study. My comments are intended to improve the structure and methodological clarity of the manuscript.

109 Please describe the existing studies. What were the interventions? How were they evaluated and what was the outcome?

2.2 Study design section

- Most of this section refers to the trial. This section should provide information about the design of this qual study. Some information in 2.5 could be included in 2.2, e.g. lines 202-205

2.3 the SDA

This section would be improved if it included information about the development of the SDA and theoretical basis (if there is one).

2.5 Data collection

- If the aim of this qual study is to examine health workers' experiences in using the SDA (123-125), why are FGDs and interviews conducted with people who have not had experience using it? This needs some clarification/justification so that it aligns with the aims of the study. Also, it would help if the topic guides were included as an additional file.

2.6 Data analysis

- The sentence in line 234 does not make sense to me ("All patterns…")

- The last sentence in this section could be improved to be more precise (e.g. Facilitators discussed their perspectives from their observations of the FGD/interviews with health workers (working where?) and member of the community (how were they identified?)
2.7 Ethical considerations

- Was verbal and written information given?

- How was informed consent provided? This isn't clear.

248-258 Some of this information may be better placed in the Discussion, particularly lines 255-258

Discussion: Please comment on the methodological limitations of the study.
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