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Reviewer's report:

Review comments

In general, this is a very interesting paper. Overall the arguments are presented well, and the discussion goes to depth in addressing issues from a theoretical, policy and global knowledge context. A minor and more general comment is to request authors to insert references for certain statements throughout the paper. In addition, the almost neat presentation of the tool and how it works seems remarkable. Given particularly the authors argue that the technology is social, one might expect that there are also ways in which this technology disrupts in a more negative than positive sense. Were there not data to this effect? Perhaps it is a question of having included participants closely associated with the intervention, and not other external voices. The authors may wish to address this. And even though this is said at the end of the manuscript, in the associated information, I suggest specifying in the text who did the interviews and focus group discussions, and also whether this study was done in a distinct region, and where exactly in rural Senegal? Finally, I do agree in general with the way the author titled the paper, and how the arguments emerge. At the same time, in some instances I got the impression the paper is actually describing how the technology influences social relations, and the 5 themes that they take up would perhaps be the pathways through which this occurs. I am not attempting to flip the paper, but just presenting another way to look at it. And in the presentation of results, may the authors describe the characteristics of the people being quoted, to help read the quotes in context.

Below are more specific comments:

Page 2, Line 57/58: Authors say "in this study we focus on..", then they list the 5 themes. I would propose rephrasing to indicate rather this is what the paper is addressing being themes that emerged in this study. To say outright that the study focuses on the themes gives the impression these may have been preconceived, and authors were interested in these themes when they carried out the study; I presume this not necessarily what the authors with to convey

Page 3. Line 25/26: I suggest moving text in parenthesis to between "causes" and "account"

Page 3; Line 29, I suggest a reference after "anemia"

Page 3, Line 41: Do the authors mean the mHealth technologies are emerging as part of the approach for MoHSA or rather more generally?

Page 4, line 46: is "accompanying her to appointments' a virtual act done via phone or it is done physically?

Page 5: Line 24-26 ("While…… health"), please re-check grammar to make more intelligible
Page 5, paragraph line 27 - 36, It is not clear that FGDs were done; rather these seem to be reported as interviews. I think a clear distinction needs to be made in the paragraph, I suggest reviewing it. Also FGDs are often held in local language, did the issue of translation affect their progress and analysis in any way?

Page 5, line 50-58: The authors' use of multiple methods should have resulted in what is often termed triangulation, which would also help to check and confirm or dispute findings across methods and techniques. Would the authors consider bringing in the concept of triangulation in their presentation of methods and discussion of study limitations?

Page 5, line 56: "a small number" - please indicate how many?

Page 6 Line 9/10: "potential power technology" - in what sense is the technology considered potentially powerful

Page 6, line 11-12: if it actors are brought together spontaneously, I would consider that this spontaneity is not serving a goal because there is spontaneity. I will ask the authors to consider re-looking.

Page 7, line 38-39: I am wondering if there is a suggestion that care groups, which are clearly a non-traditional (perhaps modern) structure 'protect' against the wider community, which would include on the whole people not connected to Care groups? In other words, the wider community seems to be considered harmful and threatening of the positives of the Care groups.

Page 8, line 48-50: May the authors please rephrase, the line is not easy to follow, Similar for Page 8, line 55-57

Page 9, line 13-17: Misinformation is listed as a source of authority that hampers health? Do the authors intend to convey this?

Page 9, 33-35, the matrone is described as somewhat superior to the traditional birth attendant of the past. I will just urge authors to approach this with a measure of caution, particularly if there is no critical review of the role and function of the traditional birth attendant of the past to accompany this observation. The conflict between change and tradition is a source of huge debate.

Related to the above, page 10 line 25 refers to western biomedical systems, appearing to position these as a benchmark from which to assess 'other' systems. This seems to go against the manner in which ethnography and qualitative research methods seek to generate contextualized understandings.

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors’ responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal