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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting topic, and the manuscript would be of interest to many readers of this journal. However, a number of issues would need to be addressed before the manuscript could be considered suitable for publication in this journal or another outlet. There is a lack of clarity about methods, the results section lacks evidence in many places, and the material is not always appropriate for each section/heading.

> ABSTRACT
- The first sentence after the label "background" is not background
- The first sentence after the label "methods" should specify what the study was conducted to do.
- The term "mHealth" should be defined the first time it is used.

> INTRODUCTION
- References must be provided to support all claims (e.g., end of first paragraph of "Background", first sentence of second paragraph of "Background").
- In the second paragraph on p.4, can a URL (or other reference) be given for Africar?
- Please provide English translations of all French terms - e.g., "Project Community Health, Collaborative Community Technology to Improve Maternal and Infant Health in Senegal (I think!) (p.4)
- The description of CommCare is very informative.

> METHODS
- The claim the "ethnography produces robust and reliable knowledge" (p.5) needs to be justified. Surely there are certain procedures that must be followed to ensure that the research is rigorous, that interpretations are valid, and that the conclusions convincing and supported by evidence.
- There is a surprising lack of clarity about hat was actually done during he course of the study:
  ... Who collected the data? There are two authors, but the singular pronoun "I" is used!
  ... How were data collected?
  ... What did the analysis actually entail? The paper only refers to "careful reading and re-reading" (p. 5)
  ... What procedures were followed to ensure rigour? Was there any validation of the analysis?
  ... How was researcher subjectivity managed?
- It is customary for study limitations to be addressed in the "Discussion" section, not the methods.
> RESULTS
- The results should not begin with a conclusion based on findings that are yet to be presented.
- Explain (in the methods) the letter-number codes that follow each quote.
- It is very odd for some themes to be presented with absolutely no supporting evidence in the form of quotes.
- Much of the paragraph after the first quote after the heading "Convening women ..." (p.6, lines 36-41) is a description of the programme: it is not a result of the study.
- The final sentence of the results section (p.10, lines 27-29) - with its use of the hackneyed terms "Global South" and "Global North" is not a presentation of results: if anywhere, it belongs in the discussion section.

> DISCUSSION
- It would be informative to include some discussion of how the data compared across the different group included in the study: was there systematic variation in the presence and importance of the different themes between the different groups?
- References must be provided to support all claims (e.g., p.11, line 22)

> CONCLUSION
- The second paragraph of this section is *not* a conclusion based on the study findings.

> PRESENTATION
- The manuscript should be proofread to ensure that there are no errors in expression, and to ensure that everything is clear and reader-friendly.
- Do not confuse "while" and "although": they are not direct synonyms.
- All sentences should be complete sentences (i.e., usually containing a verb, a subject, and an object). So, "Context matters" (p.2, p.3) is not a complete sentence. However, if it were preceded by a colon it would be an appropriate clause of the preceding sentence
- All acronyms and abbreviations must be defined/explained that first time they are used. In addition, the list of abbreviation used must be checked for completion.
- Page numbers must be given for verbatim quotes, and quotes longer than two lines should be presented separately from the main text (e.g., p.11, lines 29-33)
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