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I will start by congratulating the authors for excellently drafted paper, with plain and clearly understandable use of English Language and written in a way that flows perfectly and make reader interested in the subject written about.

I just have minor comments and suggestions which I mention below:

1. The last statement of the Background section referred to the paper aim needs addition of “to”. It is written “…this study tries provide…” and I would suggest “…this study aims to provide…”;

2. In the Methods Section, you said that the study was “…conducted from February 1 to 30, 2014…” and that is not possible as in February 2014 we only had 28 days so it needs correction;

3. Still in Methods Section, the authors said “…the total population of Hadiya zone is 1,547,848,…” but as mentioned by authors, this is an estimated figure and thus I would suggest for precision basis the following wording instead “…the total estimated population of Hadiya zone is 1,547,848,…”;

4. In Methods Section, I don’t understand why the authors present internal consistency testing for their questionnaire (Cronbach Alpha values for their questions) in this paper that aims to provide overall satisfaction of the community towards UHEP. It is also confusing when authors say that they carried out pre-testing of the questionnaire with 5% of the sample size but then nothing is mentioned if anything changed after pre-testing of it (any rewording or major change in questions, etc..). I would recommend to revisit the text and perhaps write in a way that shows that they have used pre-tested questionnaire with valid internal consistency of their questionnaire (majority of questionnaire sections above 0,70);

5. In Methods Section, the authors are somehow redundant when referring to p-value in DATA PROCESSING AND ANALYSIS part. Would suggest to revisit and avoid repetitions; Furthermore, the authors mention that data from FGD were analysed manually by categorizing in different themes and making association with quantitative data. It is not clear what is meant by “making association with quantitative data”? Does it refer to triangulation of data to contextualize (make sense) of qualitative data? Would suggest to write more clearly what this means;

6. When referring to study ethics, the authors only make reference to oral consent for the interviews and it not clear if consent was obtained for
questionnaires as well? Perhaps this would also request from authors to revisit page 5 when they mention that the interview was carried out by trained interviewers (do they mean that the questionnaires were administered by trained surveyors? I my humble opinion interviewing and administering questionnaire are not same and it necessary to be clear when writing about it – if the authors agree with my point, then they would have to revisit the whole article and make appropriate corrections regarding the use of these terminologies);

7. I have no comments regarding Results section which is clearly presented and appropriate triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data is done;

8. The first paragraph of Discussion Section starts nicely by clearly stating what the aim of the paper was, but then becomes redundant in its content by repeating the satisfaction figures (which, by the way does not match with what was mentioned in results section and requires revision!). I would suggest for the authors to state main findings of the paper after the aim and in the subsequent paragraphs they can discuss each of the main results (this would be more didactical and clear in my opinion); Furthermore, the discussion section is considerable weak and main findings of the study confronted with only one or two other findings from the literature (mainly from Ethiopia). I would suggest major revision of this section and would recommend the authors to confront with international literature. For example, the preference for female HEP (CHWs) is mentioned in many international papers and the reasons of the preference as well. If the authors can bring to the discussion not only local but international evidence it would make their paper more rich and relevant for international readers/audience;

9. No comments regarding the conclusion section;

10. The references require revision and formatting to the journal requirements.

11. No comments for the abstract and no comments for the tables;

I would end by once again congratulating the authors and encouraging them to make appropriate revision and changes as it would make their paper more "stronger”.

All the best

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
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