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**Reviewer’s report:**

The authors declined to include "Basic information on the scale of the trial ..... in the abstract (i.e. number of clusters, sampling effort)" in response to the original comment, on the grounds of length. However the current abstract could easily be made more concise, by omitting the first sentence, the statement 'all eligible......'. Without information on the size of the trial the reader does not know whether to take the paper seriously or not.

The fact that all possible combinations of interventions are not tested should be reflected in the title (e.g. changing 'and community engagement' to 'combined with community engagement'). The authors should make it clear that the trial will not give separate estimates of the effects of guppies and COMBI.

The statement of what is the primary outcome should mention how the mosquitoes are trapped (both in the summary and on p12 under 'Primary Outcome Measure'. From the rest of the paper I understand this to be adult resting collections, as described on p15.

**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:

Acceptable

**Quality of figures**

All images and figures within the manuscript should be genuine i.e. without evidence of manipulation. No specific feature within an image may be enhanced, obscured, moved, removed, or introduced. If you have concerns about the veracity of the figures you should choose the first option below.

**Statistical review**
Is it essential that this manuscript is seen by an expert statistician? If so, please give your reasons in your report.
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