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Montreal, October 22nd 2014

Dear editors of the Human Resources for Health journal,

It is with great pleasure that we are resubmitting our manuscript titled Payday, ponchos, and promotions: a qualitative analysis of perspectives from non-governmental organization program managers on community health workers motivation and incentives.

We have addressed your most recent concerns regarding authors’ contributions. I have also added our last reviews from the reviewers for your convenience.

The submitting authors have no competing interests and are available for any questions or clarifications. We thank you for your consideration.

Kind regards,

Marie-Renée B-Lajoie, MDCM, MPH
Corresponding Author
Department of Family Medicine, McGill University
marie-renee.lajoie@mcgill.ca

Jennifer Hulme, MDCM, MPH
University of Toronto, Department of Family Medicine
jennifer.hulme@mail.mcgill.ca

Kirsten Johnson, MD, MPH
McGill University, Department of Family Medicine
drkirstenjohnson@gmail.com
Point by point review:

"i would like to ask the authors to follow the examples below for the formatting of the author list in the main manuscript and to also mention in the author contributions section that both Dr Lajoie and Dr Hulme should be acknowledged as co first authors.

We have modified both the title page and the authors’ contribution section to meet your formatting.

Reviewer 1

Minor essential revisions:
1. Please check when you use CHWs (plural) and CHW.
   a. This has been carefully 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.