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Reviewer's report:

In the manuscript "Designing integrated interventions to improve nutrition and WASH behaviors in Kenya" the authors seek to describe the rationale, process, and feasibility of an intervention designed to improve WASH within a larger nutrition-sensitive intervention delivered among Kenyan children. The intervention approach is interesting as the authors essentially are using the infrastructure of a large intervention to affect multiple outcomes. However, the authors do not present this context clearly and the manuscript is in need of restructuring. Thus my comments are not specific at this point in time, more global.

First, the authors have a lot of the justification and rationale for their approach in the method section (e.g., the description of the Behaviora Change Wheel or COM-B). These need to be in the introduction- this is setting the stage for what you did. In the method section, discuss your methods specific to the results you are going to present. In the results section, its not about what you did its about what you found. For example in the first paragraph of step 1 - you have the purpose of the step (goes in the intro), and then how you conducted it (goes in the method section) before you get to the findings. The figure you present with the steps is a good organizing feature, but you do not make reference to it within the manuscript.

Second, I would encourage the authors to consider the amount of detail they are presenting in this manuscript. One "step" is already published/described elsewhere. I wonder then if it does not make sense to include here (you can certainly refer to it, but why spend the time describing the process here?). In the same vein, I would like to see the methods section structured in the same stepped process that the results are presented in - I think this will make it much easier for the reader to follow.

Third, the intervention you are designing is focused on the outcome of stunting, but the introduction also has information on nutrition-sensitive approaches and WASH. The first paragraph is about malnutrition, then we turn to stunting and then WASH and stunting in the second. I understand that because you're talking about an integrated intervention you have to talk about these elements, but I would like to see the introduction more streamlined. Be clear on what the outcome is you are trying to affect. Related to the first point, I would remind the authors that this journal is not content specific, so though the etiology of malnutrition is purportedly well-documented, it is not implicit to this audience.

Finally, the tremendous value of a journal such as Pilot and Feasibility Studies is a place for researchers to spend time discussing all of the hard work that comes before the efficacy/effectiveness trial, but it is also an asset for those who are just starting down this road.
Therefore, I'd like the authors to consider reorienting the manuscript to balance these two needs. A reader, who is going to design any behavioral intervention not necessarily a WASH intervention, should walk away being like, oh yes this is the process I am going to apply to my topic.
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