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Response to Reviewer:

We would like to thank you for the reading work you have done. Your comments have allowed us to rework our article. These comments will also help us in our future work. You will find our answers to your questions and comments in the yellow sections. The entire article and our responses have been proof-edited by an English-language editor. Best regard.

Abstract:

Abstract, background – second sentence refers to ‘factors’; however, the conclusion refers to ‘contextual elements. I recommend use of consistent terminology when referring to factors or contextual elements, i.e., choose one.
Response: We choose to use contextual elements.

Methodology, the term actors is introduced. Please see my subsequent comments about language consistency when referring to participants.
Response: We have replaced the term "actors" with "participants" throughout the text in order to avoid confusion.

Results, third sentence, you state ‘among those who’ when referring to constructions. This should be ‘among those that because constructions are not people.
Response: We made the appropriate corrections.

When stating ‘the quality and strength of the evidence is the only construct that obtained the highest score this can be reworded to ‘quality and strength of the evidence construct received the highest score’. The meaning of the remainder of this sentence, which specifies 'and that can be compared with the origin of the intervention into ‘, is not clear and needs to be reworded.
Response: We have replaced the term "actors" with "participants" throughout the text in order to avoid confusion.
Contribution to the literature

Dot point three, the language ‘it seems that’ is not consistent with academic language. I suggest you reword this to say ‘the findings of this study suggest that the CFIR framework…’. The second sentence within this dot point refers to ‘these five dimensions’; however, the five dimensions have not been previously referred to and so the reader at this point in the paper does not understand what you are referring to. Also, when stating that the ‘CFIR framework remains a relevant analytical tool’, I recommend you re-word this to ‘is a relevant analytical tool’.

Response: This part has been rewritten as shown below:

- This study shows that when an intervention is designed taking into account the expectations of the main participants and the realities of the local context, its implementation benefits from a sincere commitment from the beneficiaries.
- The application of the CFIR framework and its five dimensions inevitably requires its contextualization, especially when it is used to analyze interventions that are not patient-oriented and in a context different from health facilities.
- The CFIR framework is a relevant analytical tool in the West African context where multiple interventions are implemented at the same time, and some fail to achieve their objectives.

Background

Third sentence, you state ‘it is therefore important to find interventions that adapt to different contexts’. However, I believe you mean it is important to identify interventions that are adaptable to different contexts. I suggest you reword the sentence to this effect.

Response: This sentence has been rewritten as suggested. (See line three Background section)

Sentences six and seven, refer to those seeking to learn from the strategy and the lack of research to explain and report on implementation. These two sentences need references.

Response: A reference has been added

Last two sentences of the first paragraph refer to factors and elements. Please use one term so the reader knows you are referring to the same thing.

Response: We chose the term “element”.

Paragraph 2, last two sentences, report that the fight against dengue fever has not been a concern for actors working in the health field and a few activities have been organised in this direction. These points need references. And clarity about the phrase ‘in this direction’ is required – in what direction?

Response: We have added the two references to this part of the text.

Paragraph 4, opens with ‘this evidence-based intervention - which intervention are you referring to?

Response: We are referring to the subject of this article. We made the clarification, and added one reference.
Paragraph 4, second sentence, refers to ‘the choice by a local NGO ‘– please expand on what choice they were making, or what options they were choosing from. Also, in this sentence this is the first time the term NGO is referred to, please write it in full.
Response: We have deleted this part in order to make the sentence more comprehensive

AGIR is a local association working in the field of health promotion. It is the association that has implemented, in collaboration with other actors, the community-based intervention in the control of dengue fever, the implementation which is analysed in this article.

Paragraph 4, refers to the AGIR/SD. Please add a sentence to explain what AGIR is
Response: This sentence has been added: “AGIR/SD: is a local association working in the field of health promotion. It is the association that has implemented, in collaboration with other actors, the community-based intervention in the control of dengue fever in Burkina Faso”.

Paragraph 4, second last sentence, you state ‘this study noted ‘. Please reword this to say ‘the researchers reported ‘.
Response: The correction was made.

Paragraph 4, last sentence, I suggest you reword this sentence to say ‘the objective of this article is to report on the evaluation of the process of implementation‘.
Response: The second paragraph presents a review of the literature on the importance of taking contextual elements into account in the analysis of implementation. Several references were used.

Methods

Please insert a section headed Design and add a description of the study design.
Response: A section has been added.

Context

In this paragraph and elsewhere in the manuscript you refer to the former administrative sector 22. I recommend instead that you refer to this sector more generally as a ‘specific administrative sector’. You could add some more information to explain that this is one of xx administrative sectors within the region. You may also add some detail about size of the population within the sector.
Response: We replaced “the former administrative sector 22” with “a specific administrative sector” throughout the article as per your suggestion. We also added this clarifying sentence: “In Burkina Faso, an administrative sector is an area covering a population of approximately 300 or more people”.

In the last sentence of the paragraph on context please reword to state: Ethics approval to conduct the study was given by the National Health Ethics Committee.
Response: The correction was made as suggested.
Conceptual framework

Second paragraph, you point out that the CFIR was adapted according to the context of the intervention. Please explain how it was adapted and why
Response: Not all elements of the framework have been taken into account in this article. That is why we say it has been adapted. The details are specified in the second paragraph of this section and we return to it in the discussion.

Second paragraph, you state, ‘however, since it is a community and population based intervention’. Please substitute the word ‘it’ for the term ‘intervention’.
Response: The correction was made.

Study population

Here you use the term ‘participants’. Previously you have referred to the sample as actors. Later in the manuscript you use different terminology again. For example, the terms ‘participants’, ‘field actors’, ‘implementing actors’ and ‘actors of the intervention’, are also used. I recommend you use the term ‘participant throughout.
Response: We have used the term “participant” instead of all other terminology.

I recommend you delete the sentence ‘As there were not many (29), the research team decided to involve them all’.
I also recommend you remove the sentence stating that all interested parties were invited to participate in focus group and interviews. This should be included in the data collection section, as focus group and individual interviews has not yet been mentioned.
Response: The correction was made at the place indicated following your comments.

Data collection

The fourth sentence, refers to ‘discussion sessions’. I believe you are referring to the focus group interviews and recommend you use this language. Sentence five also refers to discussion with facilitators. Please ensure you use clear and consistent language.
Response: The corrections have been made for this suggestion.

Data processing and analysis
In the second sentence, you state ‘completed by various groups’. What groups are you referring to?
Response: The groups refer to participants in the three sub-areas where data collection took place. The activities were implemented in three sub-areas: Yitouni, Cité Azimo & AnIV B, Tampouy Bilbalogho

In the fifth sentence, you refer to ‘extract verbatims’. I believe you mean ‘verbatim quotes
Response: Yes, it’s verbatim quotes. We made the appropriate correction.
Results

The first sentence refers to 18 constructed structures between the three sub-areas of the community intervention. It is not clear what you mean by ‘constructed structures’ or ‘the three sub-areas’. Please reword this sentence to ensure these elements are clear. Sentence has reworded:
Response: The sentence has been rewritten: “Table 3 summarizes the scores assigned by the study participants to the constructs of the framework used. Responses vary very little from one sub-area to another.

External context, Network

In the first sentence of the section for Network, you refer to network previously set up. However, I am not clear what network you are referring to. Please be specific.
Response: The sentence has been reworded: “AGIR/SD, who is the operator of the intervention, did not have a network in the intervention zone beforehand.

Preparation of implementation

You state the variation in climate had a positive and negative influence on the intervention. However, you do not elaborate on this and the reader is left questioning what you mean. Please explain in the manuscript, perhaps by way of examples, what the negative and positive influences were.
Response: Indeed, before the outbreak of the dengue epidemic in Ouagadougou, many participants did not attach enough importance to intervention activities. When many people started contracting dengue fever, then they began to take part in the activities organized as part of the community-based dengue control intervention.

Self-efficacy

The first sentence of this section opens with ‘belief in its ability’. Please substitute the term ‘its’ with the specific term you are referring to.
Response: The sentence has been deleted.

In this section, you refer to ‘the mastery of animation techniques’. It is not clear what you mean I recommend rewording to something like ‘mastery of the techniques illustrated in the animation’.
Response: Here is the rewritten sentence: “Mastery of animation techniques illustrated in the animation is one of the behaviours that required self-confidence on the part of the participants.”

Planification

This section opens with reference to ‘the promoters’ « participants ». Who are you referring to – please be specific about who is promoting intervention.
Response: We used “participants”.
The second sentence appears to be a quote. Where does the quote end – please insert the closing quotation mark.
Response: The correction has been made. It is a quote.

You state, ‘in the group of facilitators, we think that this way of working is better than some of the experience we have had’. Is this a quote? If so, please use quotation marks. If this is your opinion, then this statement should be removed.
Response: It is a quote. We added the necessary quotation marks.

Discussion

The first sentence of the discussion refers to the characteristics. I believe you are referring to the characteristics of the intervention. Please specify this so that is clear.
Response: This has been done.

The second paragraph, second sentence, states the actors of the intervention did not feel an exaggerated sense of complexity. I recommend you simplify the language here by saying something like ‘the intervention was perceived by participants as simple’, or you could use another term such as ‘straightforward’ instead of ‘simple
Response: We have rewritten this section using your suggested sentence.

In paragraph 4, in the last sentence, you state that CFIR was very interesting. This statement is not very meaningful to the reader. You need to be more specific about the value of this tool. Alternatively, you could remove this sentence altogether.
What are the implications of your findings for future practice, research and policy?
 Were there any limitations to your study?
Response: We have added a few sentences of reflection on the use of the CFIR. We have also added a section on methodological limitations and implication for practice and research.

Conclusion

The opening sentence of the conclusion states the objective of the study. Here you say the objective was to analyse the influence of contextual elements on the implementation process. Rather than saying the study achieved its objectives by identifying the elements of context that positively influenced implementation and those that constituted barriers, please specify the elements that were positive influence and those that were barriers. The final sentence in conclusion needs to be reworded to be more meaningful.

We propose this conclusion: The study achieved its objectives by identifying the elements of context that positively influenced implementation and those that constituted barriers. The results of study indicated that the origin of intervention, quality and strength of evidence, self efficacy, and planification made the intervention easier. However, network, available resources, and structural characteristics have negatively influenced the implementation of community-based intervention to control dengue fever in Burkina Faso.