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Reviewer's report:

Overall: I appreciate the way in which the authors incorporated feedback from the first round of review, and think that this manuscript is much improved with a more clear message and most importantly, a set of lessons from your work that can be conveyed to others who will plan to implement a similar program and/or who plan to use CFIR in future implementation studies. My specific comments are included below:

Background
-Line 4 should read "'has increased""
-Lines 6-8 read a bit odd; I believe this is a list of local initiatives; so why then the Chennai example? Or there are community-based initiatives? The word local somehow didn't work - and the line "'impact on..."' also didn't seem to be part of a list of programs/initiatives
-Line 13: you are also assessing the challenges, in addition to successes, yes? I would add challenges in.
-Line 26 - could you add in the date of the initiative launch?"

Methods
Context

In the response for the question posed "'Can you describe who the facilitators are? Also what is the monitoring committee?"' you helped me as a reader by inserting a response into the feedback to the reviewer, but did not add into the text. I think this response should be added to the manuscript so all readers understand this contextual piece.

Conceptual framework

I think even if you are developing another paper for IS on the exclusive of certain components of CFIR you can still add one or two lines stating this briefly (why they were not relevant omitted them)"

Study Population

Again I think the text you used here to explain to the reviewer would be helpful added into the narrative --the piece on "'All those involved in the implementation of the intervention....."' even though you did make some changes on page 4.

-Line 26 you state that no specific criteria were used, but you did actually have some basic criteria that you listed in the response in terms of who was involved"

Same comments for "Our first step was to get...." - best to add this in too. If I had the question as a reviewer, I think other readers will benefit by having this information.
Results
Is it true that you used the scores as a ranking activity to then prompt the study participants to discuss the concepts? That is the way I am reading it now, but I think this could be stated more explicitly."

1.2 (Line 35) - I am still not convinced this is addressing the concept of quality and strength of the evidence - the first line seems to imply that participants felt this strategy was better in comparison to others they have seen (mass spraying) - but why? Why did they have positive view of this program as it relates to any evidence they would have about how it should work - are there features of other programs that led them to believe features of this program would work? The evidence can certainly be anecdotal, or from their past experience, but this link isn't fully clear to me. (e.g. when you talk about knowledge and skills they acquired - is this as a result of the program? Or previously? Maybe this was not an important construct, but right now was written I get a little lost in the explanation.

Discussion
Overall: I think the discussion has improved pieces, but could be simplified a bit to avoid repeating statements made previously (as commented in the line above). You reflect on what you learned, how it relates to other findings, and then how this can be useful--and that structure in general works well. I also really like your final conclusion.

Line 12- I am not sure what you mean by ""We are at the heart of…"" and have a hard time relating this to the point you are trying to make."

Line 20-21 "AS the actors…" is an incomplete thought/sentence.

Line 50-51 - What does "of this intervention will of leaders…” mean? Needs some editing.

Line 8-9 on the last page - seems repetitive.

Line 11-12 last page: you sa the key is not to design an intervention properly --I think what you mean is not to JUST design an appropriate intervention but ALSO to…
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