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Reviewer's report:

This is a manuscript on an important topic both in the content (HTN and HIV integration) and in the methodology of qualitative research using CFIR. This manuscript makes a contribution in these two emerging areas. The Authors have demonstrated facilitating and limiting factors in the integration of screening and treatment of HTN into the HIV program in Uganda. However, there are a few areas that the authors need to review before the manuscript can be published. They are meant to strengthen the paper and not necessarily to alter the arguments in it:

* This is a paper with clear methods and results. My main concern is the complex nature in the way the results have been presented both in the abstract and lines 245 - 258. They would be confusing to lay persons including policy makers and health care workers. Despite some explanation in the appendices, the use of phrases like, "distinguishing performance weakly" need adequate comprehension. The authors should review such terms like; distinguishing and non-distinguishing performance, negative and positive influence, weak and strong. I would propose the authors incorporate a lay summary just explaining the barriers and facilitators, and how were they linked to performance of the clinics.

* It is good that the authors have explained what CFIR is in the background. It will be helpful if they provide additional information on and justify why they decided to use it compared to other methods, its relevance to the study and how/ why they decided of the 17 constructs out of the 39.

* In the methods, there is an expression that the authors used both deductive (based on CFIR) and open coding. Open coding is not coming out clearly in the results. What has been presented is solely based on the use of the CFIR framework. Were there any other issues that came up as barriers and facilitators despite those depicted from the 17 constructs?

* Other minor comments; nothing mentioned about FGDs in the abstract and remove the full stop after the word 'previously' on page 471.
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