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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has improved substantially.

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

Discretionary revisions:
5. First sentence conclusions in abstract is not very clear to me.
6. In Methods section, you are still referring to a "questionnaire".
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.
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.

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.
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.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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