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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
• The manuscript is well written and provides useful information which is relevant to resource limited context. However, the paper would benefit if it is shorter and present data in more precise way. Namely I would suggest in the results section to present summary statements, which will be followed by 2 or 3 quotes. Furthermore, I would also suggest shortening the quotes too. The study will also benefit if better structured recommendations are developed and presented.

Minor Essential Revisions
• For some topics, there is considerable difference between the views expressed by professionals at central and local level, hence the authors may consider presenting results separately for these two groups
• The authors call their study as descriptive case study, while it is more qualitative research. For the case study, they would need to have different format, now it is not clear what is the case, it is rather obtaining data on a common phenomenon
• On the page 2, paragraph 1 – it says “However, these discussions are not backed by empirical evidence. Hence, a need for having such evidence is crucial…” I guess the better approach would be to have rigorous scientific evidence rather than empirical evidence
• While describing the country context, it would be also informative to review national regulations/legal basis pertinent to task shifting, i.e. do regulations allow it, or come to conflict, or is there a gap? It would be also helpful to give more details on national health workforce (or focus can be made on one particular region/district), including scope of work of different job positions, to get better ideas what tasks are or can be shifted
• In the data collection section – it would be helpful to give more details on the specific topics addressed by the interview guides
• The fact that data were tape-recorded is not reflected in the data collection section
• For some topics that are discussed in the results section no quotes are provided – e.g. rural retention, coverage and access to health services on page 21.
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