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Reviewer's report:

Dear Author,

Thank you for addressing some comments on the previous draft.

Although the introduction and the method sections are organized nicely, you fail to response/incorporate some major comments from both reviewers. Particularly, sample size calculation, result sections and the discussion. It would be great if you go through the comments again and address them accordingly. Mention all changes in your "response to reviewer" in each page and line.

Additional Major comments:

Objectives:

This study seems a feasibility and acceptability study so it is better to avoid/remove the unnecessary objectives and focus on the main outcomes. For example Objective:1 is unnecessary, 2-3,6 are assessing feasibility, and acceptability, 5-sustainability (difficult to achieve this with this limited data/information and using the methods), 7-8 not clear and did not reflect in the method and result section clearly.

Page 7 (line 20-22): Not sure why you are planning for a separate manuscript with the same objective? Either drop this or clearly mention the primary objective/outcome of that paper rather than just saying "Other aspect of study feasibility".

Methods:

1. Selection of the respondents for qualitative interviews, analysis plan should clearly and separately mention.

2. mama kit or Maama kit? also did not define this in the method section.

4. Data analysis plan and sample size calculation: combine together and qualitative and quantitative methods should separately describe with sufficient evidence. (previous comment from both reviewers). Additionally, fails to clearly mention the definitions of feasibility, acceptable (use) in the method section (previous comments from reviewer 2).

5. page 11 (line 57-65): not clear/repetition

Result:

1. Qualitative and quantitative results should put separately. Quantify the number rather than using mostly, majority (only) etc. throughout the result section.

2. Page 12 (page 46-51): not result, this sounds like discussion.

3. Page 13 (26-31): did not describe clearly in the method section, how you collected this data?

4. Page 13 (33-55): This is obvious for all studies around the globe and this should not be included.

5. Page 14 (page 36): correct tense


7. Page 15 (line 11-21): Not result (Repetition of method section)

8. Page 15 (line 38-48): Not clear/clearly mention this in the analysis plan

9. Page 15 (line 50-63): Not result (Repetition of method section)
Discussion:

1. Insufficient literature review and comparison with other recent HW paper. Similar types of activities have performed in different LMIC using different products.

The role of the discussion is to explain what the results mean. Sometimes it is tempting to list all the possible interpretations and 'let the reader choose' what is the most reasonable. This is an abrogation of the responsibility of the author. As the person who analyzed the data and knows the study, you are in the best situation to explain what the most likely interpretation is and defend it. This is not to say that other important potential interpretations shouldn't be mentioned, but rather that you as the author should clearly state what you believe the data means and why. For example, if you just say our study is novel, first study, and no one did this previously, this is not sufficient. You should provide sufficient evidence to support your statement.

2. Avoid repeating the same results in the discussion section.

3. Page 16 (line 53): Did not see these organisms in the method section.

4. Limitations: Need a separate section to highlight the limitations of the study.
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