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Reviewer's report:

The authors have carefully addressed all my suggestions.

I have just a few additional minor suggestions listed below and one comment. The comment is that it might be worth suggesting a need for the development and testing of simple algorithms for CHWs to use in the case of non-malaria febrile illness (like iCCM or a variant thereof) as a strategy to try to reduce over-prescription of antibiotics for inappropriate indications such as the common cold.

Abstract. The first sentence in the Methods is incomplete.

Line 28. Should be "..result and treatment were compared...".

Line 53. Looks like a word is missing: "...was low ((53.2%...).

Line 55. Test should be singular.

Page 4, line 55. The abbreviation, CQ, is introduced on page 7. Should be introduced here and used subsequently.

The abbreviation, CHWs, is introduced on page 4 but not used consistently (for example p5, line 21; p11, line 26; p 11, line 40 and several other locations in the Discussion).

On page 5 where the Afghan public health system is described, the abbreviations for BHC and CHC could be introduced.

Page 7, line 2. Should this be 'differed' rather than 'differing'?
Line 59. Could use CQ here and SP for SP and artesunate).

Page 10, line 52. Should be "Adjustment for covariates was...".

Page 13, line 50. No need for the comma after PCR results.

Page 14, line 43. Should be "most common alternative diagnoses recorded by CHWs were either...".

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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