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GENERAL
This is an interesting and important study in the area of health care services utilization. It matches the journal scope and worth sharing among the journal's readers. However, I think cultural background is a major confounder in this study topic. For me, adding the religious variable to the demographic characteristics of RDW participants will be of great value.

With considering few issues detailed below, this manuscript can be further enhanced.

METHODS

Study design

Page 5, line 107; it is mentioned "This qualitative study employed semi-structured focus group discussions". What is the level of structuring of the interviews (interview standardization and moderator involvement). Did the study use a more or less structured approach?

Selection of study participants

Page 5, lines 115 and 116; it is mentioned "CHWs were selected from a list provided by the district council health management team under the MoHCDGEC". It is not clear on what base they were selected (e.g. years of experience, recommendation, etc.)? Authors need to elaborate more on recruitment procedure (for example, was there any screening effort conducted to select participants from among the MoHCDGEC list? Also, it is mentioned in lines 104 and 105 "Where possible, areas where CHWs operate were selected for the purpose of information triangulation and variation in responses." Is this a sort of purposive sampling to achieve this purpose of information triangulation and variation in responses? However, authors need to be cautious as in focus group studies, participants must feel able to talk to each other, and wide gaps in social background or lifestyle can defeat this requirement. Authors may need to clarify this point.

Page 6, lines 117 and 118; it is mentioned "RDW were selected based on the number of visits received from a CHW, timing of visit (pre or post delivery), and distance from nearest health facility. This is not clear. Do authors mean, the more a RDW received visits, the more likely she may be selected or vice versa? Please clarify with justification. Also, it is not clear why selection
of RDWs was based on these criteria (number of visits, timing of visit, and distance from nearest health facility)? Please elaborate on selection methods for both groups.

RESULT

Page 7, lines 144 and 145; it is mentioned "There was a relatively even number of male and female CHWs sampled." Is this a result of purposive sampling? Was there any sort of segmentation (control of group composition to match chosen categories of participants) in participants' selection? Please explain.

CONCLUSION

Conclusion section should be short and concise. Also it should be based on information mentioned in the body of the manuscript with no need for new information, so it is not appropriate to include references in this section.
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