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Montreal, October 2nd 2014

Object: Response to Reviewers' second comments regarding the paper *Payday, ponchos, and promotions: a qualitative analysis of perspectives from non-governmental organization program managers on community health worker motivation and incentives*

Dear Editor,

We want to thank you for your prompt response to the reviewers' comments we provided.

Below you will find detailed response to all of the reviewers’ comments.

Please note that both Dr B-Lajoie and Dr Hulme should be acknowledged as co-first authors.

The revised file is attached here for your review.

Kind regards,

Marie-Renée B-Lajoie, MDCM, MPH
Jennifer Hulme, MDCM, MPH
Kirsten Johnson, MD, MPH
Reviewer 1

Minor essential revisions:
1. Please check when you use CHWs (plural) and CHW.
   a. This has been careful reviewed.
2. NGO: this abbreviation is explained too many times in the text (both abstract and main text)
   a. This has been addressed. It is now explained once in the abstract and once in the main text.
3. Results section abstract: better to present it in past tense.
   a. This has been corrected.
4. Reference 3 should read WHO.
   a. This has been corrected.

Discretionary revisions:
5. First sentence, conclusions, in abstract, is not very clear to me.
   a. This has been edited for clarity.
6. In Methods section, you are still referring to a "questionnaire".
   a. This now states ‘interview guide’
7. Do we need the whole of box 1? It might be better to shortly state the main themes that were covered in the topic guide.
   a. Another reviewer requested the complete guide.
8. I would like to recommend to make box 2 shorter. Prioritize quotes and delete some who don't add much value. Last part: there is a double quote.
   a. Box 2 was created to answer another reviewer’s comments. We agree that it is too long and redundant. Please find the edited version attached here.

Major compulsory revisions:
9. Box 3 has improved now, but could you please explain better in the accompanying text what the money is used for? Personal? For the programme? Still not that clear.
   a. Money was used for personal emergencies, now noted in the text.
10. I miss limitations in the discussion section. I am triggered on this because in one of your answers you say that your study did not include CHW/ community views. This could be made explicit as limitation, and other limitations could be added as well. This would improve the manuscript further.
    a. This is now addressed in the second paragraph of the discussion. Thank you for noting this oversight.

Reviewer 2
« It's fine as-is. »
Thank you.

Reviewer 3
« The responses to my suggested revisions are all adequate. I would be fine with proceeding with publishing. »
Thank you.