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Dear Madam,

Thank you for providing reviewers’ comments for our manuscript.

Please find the following changes we made based on the reviewers’ feedbacks:

**Reviewer's report**
Title: Impact of dropout of female volunteer community health workers in Dhaka urban slums
Version: 2 Date: 10 May 2012
Reviewer: Muhammad Ahmed Abdullah
Reviewer's report:
Major compulsory revisions.
1. The title should include the study design as per BMC rules.
   *This is an explorative study and title has been changed accordingly.*

Minor essential revisions
1. Probably needs a final spell check. For example in the word objective in the background part of the abstract is mis-spelled.
   *Language correction along with final spelling check has been done.*

2. Most of the issues have already been addressed after the first revision.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

**Reviewer's report**
Title: Impact of dropout of female volunteer community health workers in Dhaka urban slums
Version: 2 Date: 27 May 2012
Reviewer: Gul Rukh Mehboob
Reviewer's report:
Major Compulsory Revisions:
The title of the paper refers only to the impact on the community. It must be revised as the study also deals with the impact of the drop out on the providers of the services.
The word community in the title is a part of “female volunteer community health workers”; it does not refer to the impact on the community. In fact, there is no mention in the title that study deals with the impact on the community or impact on BRAC.

In the methods section, the population of the study and sampling techniques have not been mentioned. If the authors have considered all the CHW’s or offices responsible to bear the costs of training and recruitment, universal sampling technique should be mentioned.

At method section, under Study sites, respondents and duration, we made clear that we adopt a complete count within our purposively selected two study sites rather than following any sampling technique. (Please see last para at page 6 and 1st para at page 7 under Study sites, respondents and duration)

Minor Essential Revisions:
The whole document needs to be shorten. There are unnecessary details and the authors have repeated the same arguments throughout the study.
In the background section, it is better to brief and merge third and fourth paragraph. The last paragraph describing aims of the study should be made fourth paragraph of the study followed by the merged third and fourth paragraph briefing the audience on findings and implications.

The 3rd and 4th paragraph have been merged and synergized. (Please see 2nd para at page 4 and 1st para at page 5)
The last paragraph also has been made 4th paragraph and organized describing aims of the study. (Please see last para at page 5)

The Methods section can follow the order as:
1. Study site and duration of the study
2. Population and sampling
3. Approaches used
4. For the collected costs it is better to use a flow chart showing the capital and recurrent costs and its sub-categories followed by one or two paragraph description.
5. The data analysis can be the last sub-heading.
This will not only reduce the length of the methods section but will also bring clarity in the document.

The whole Method section has been organized and edited to bring clarity. Capital cost and recurrent cost have been organized in two paragraphs. (Please see page 6-11)

Discussion section should be labelled as "discussion and implications" and needs to be strengthened. It should be supported with more references and evidence from other countries. The last paragraph of the discussion actually shows the significance of the study. It can be made part of the background (one or two liner)

According to the journal format we kept the label “Discussion”.

Discretionary revisions:
In the last paragraph of the background the author has mentioned two main objectives. However, the second one which deals with the comparison of costs of drop out borne by the service provider and community has not been addressed. It will be better if this comparison is also made part of the study, if not this objective must be eliminated from the study. 

Comparison between the cost of possible strategies reducing dropout and the cost of dropout combined on BRAC and on the community has been described in the 2nd paragraph of Discussion section (Please see last para at page 16 and 1st para at 17).

There are grammatical mistakes in the document. Minor corrections needs to be made

The whole manuscript has been revised to correct grammatical mistakes.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field 
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.

Now, I would like to request you to publish our manuscript. I shall be more than happy to answer any queries from your end and from the two reviewers.

I look forward to receiving your cooperation for publishing of our revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

(Khurshid Alam)
On behalf of the authors