

Peer Review

Review of: "Evaluation of Nyumba Ni Choo: A National Campaign to Promote Improved Sanitation in Tanzania Between 2016–2020"

Jamie Myers^{1,2}

1. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton, United Kingdom; 2. University of Leeds, United Kingdom

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review this article. I enjoyed reading it very much. The study is interesting, well-written, and novel. However, there are parts that need to be strengthened before I would recommend it to be peer-approved.

Firstly, and most importantly, I can see clearly how the evidence collated can be used to support the causal claims made around the implementation and outputs; however, I am less convinced about the causal claim from output to outcome. It is my understanding from using Contribution Analysis that time is also spent collecting data around and analysing potential rival explanations and contextual factors that enabled change to take place. It was not clear if this is something you did or if this is something the MRC framework required. I was therefore not so convinced by the claim that 'the project achieved an increase in the rate at which households improved their sanitation facilities without government subsidy, using only a messaging campaign, through behaviour change' as I do not know what else may have been taking place at the time and what other influences (rival explanations and contexts) could have contributed to the observed change.

I also got a bit lost in paragraph 5 of the qualitative data collection part of the methods section. It wasn't clear to me the reasoning behind the assumptions that were made. If these could be added, that would be great. I would also like to see more details of the qualitative methods, including the number of semi-structured interviews conducted.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.