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Author’s response to reviews:

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 purple sections. The entire article and our responses have been proof-edited by an English-language editor. Best regard

1. Background, Paragraph 5, you state "the choice by a local Non Governmental Organization (NGO) that was fully aware of the context". It is still not clear what you mean by choice? Do you mean the 'decision to participate in the intervention implementation by a local Non Governmental Organization (NGO)..."?
Response : What we meant was that instead of the promoters implementing the intervention, they chose a local NGO to do so. This choice is based on the idea that this local NGO knows the context of the intervention area better. We rewrote the sentence « Use a local Non Governmental Organization (NGO) to implement the intervention»

2. Data processing and analysis, third sentence - you state: "Then, a summary table of data from all groups was designed to serve as a basis for analysis". In your response to my previous comments, you detailed what the groups were; however, you have not incorporated this into the manuscript. Please specify, in the manuscript, which groups you are referring to.
Response : We rewrote the sentence « Then, a summary table of data from all groups (the participants in the three sub-areas where data collection took place:Yitouni, Cité Azimo & AnIV B, Tampouy Bilbalogho) was designed to serve as a basis for analysis »

3. External context, Network, first sentence - in my previous review I pointed out that it is not clear what network you are referring to. This still remains unclear. You currently indicate that AGIR/SD did not have a network in the intervention zone beforehand. Do you mean that AGIR/SD were not operating in the intervention zone prior to this project? Or are you saying they did not previously have a communication (or some other form of) network in the intervention zone prior to this project? Please be more specific so that the reader can understand your meaning.
Response : Yes, We want to mean that AGIR/SD were not operating in the intervention zone prior to this project. The sentence were rewrote

4. Self-efficacy, first sentence - the term 'Behe' has been added. This is the only time this term is used. What does it mean? Or this a typographical error?
Response : Yes it’s a typographical error. The term has been deleted

5. Discussion, Paragraph 5, latter part of the second sentence needs to be re-worded for clarity/grammar: “how an adaptation to the context of the CFIR could be fruitful to understand the implementation of a knowledge the context intervention (46)”. Please re-word.
Response : We rewrote the sentence « Recent research in Burkina Faso has shown that an adaptation of the CFIR to context could be fruitful to explain the factors that influence implementation (46). »

6. Discussion, Paragraph 5, the last sentence of this paragraph, which refers to a CFIR Inner Setting scale, needs to be revised. You refer to ‘recent attempts’ but only one reference is provided. Either add other references or revise to ‘a recent attempt’. Also, ‘an interesting viewpoint’ is not informative to reader. It would be better to simply state ‘Recent attempts have been made by researchers to create a CFIR Inner Setting scale’.
Response : The sentence has been corrected according to your instructions. « Recent attempt have been made by researchers to create a CFIR Inner Setting scale (8)»

7. In the paragraph on methodological limitations, I recommend that you move the sentence about the first author, to after the sentence about conflict of interest (because the first author does not have a conflict of interest, as I understand).
Response : The correction was made as you indicated.

8. In the conclusion, you use the term 'self efficacity' - please correct to 'self-efficacy'.
Response : The correction has been made

All submissions must include a populated checklist from the relevant reporting guideline(s) appropriate for the study design or type of report. The completed checklist(s) should be provided as an 'Additional file' and referenced in the text. For further information, please see the specific article type guidelines here: https://implementationscience.biomedcentral.com/submission-guidelines/preparing-your-manuscript
Response: We used as populated checklist TIDieR. Please find additional file at pages 17-18.