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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

The article is relevant. This is the time when countries and international organizations are discussing issues related to human resources for health. As such this article will be very useful to decision makers on issues pertaining to HRH. The article reads well and makes a reader understand easily what the writers are putting across. In particular the article comes up with questions which are clear for action.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

Sampling was done to Government facilities only. It would be important to indicate why NGO facilities were not included for comparison. Tanzania has a considerable number of FBO facilities and this would have given a good comparison. Probably a mention about this and the reason for exclusion would be important. Also there is an issue of random sampling of all health workers to get 12 nurses and 12 clinicians in a district. Although it is good to do a random sample in Qualitative data one is not inclined to do so. The use of convenient sampling would have been adequate especially to get information from information rich informants. Probably this needs more explanation.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

Conducting FGD in Kiswahili and writing it in English has important implications that need to be highlighted in an academic article. Probably this needs explanation. In addition I wonder whether ethical issues should appear before other items of methods as several ethical issues were done before data collection. To me that would read better chronologically.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

The whole article displayed answers where for each theme only an individual or two are quoted for the most prominent narration. There should be other forms of data presentation such as Tables and Boxes for more clarity.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

Yes the discussion and conclusion are well balanced and supported by the data.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

In the last sentence of Summary there is a mention that the results suggest review of policy without imposing additional burden to resources. However there are issues such as training that need
additional resources. Probably it should read mostly policy review with minimum additional resources.

7. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes

All points raised are minor revisions which the author can be trusted to correct

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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.
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