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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions
1. It is not clear what the likert response choices were for both the satisfaction survey and motivation survey. On page 5 the authors say that it is a 5-level likert scale, but the tables present presumably binary results (satisfied vs. not; agreed vs. did not.) Where was the cutoff in the 5-level scale made? When conducting the PCA, did you retain the 5-level responses or did you use the binary results?

2. In the last paragraph of the “data collection methods” section, the authors say that “unprompted response categories” were used. It is not clear what this means, particularly since earlier they said that the satisfaction and motivation questions all had 5-level likert responses.

3. How were the composite scores generated for each factor? Did you use factor loadings? Did you remove variables that did not load strongly on that factor?

4. The authors report scores out of four, but it is not clear how these scores were created. Are these from the factor loadings?

5. What method was used to assess differences in factor scores by demographic characteristics? Linear regression? Did you account for clustering? Please show your regression results in a table.

6. While the results of the PCA for the motivation survey give meaningful categories, the results of the satisfaction survey do not. The authors discuss individual questions in their discussion and conclusions. I question the added value of using the PCA results for the satisfaction survey.

7. How was the wealth index constructed? The results in table 1 should be clarified.

Minor essential revisions
1. How many hours a month are CHWs expected to work? Do you have self-report for how much the interviewed CHWs actually work? This will provide very important context for their responses.

2. The last paragraph of the “national context” section is a run-on sentence. Please re-write to make your objectives more clear.

3. Please include the dates of data collection in the methods section.

4. In the first sentence under “data collection methods” the word “Kiswahili” should be replaced with “Swahili.” The authors use “Swahili” later in the
manuscript.

5. The third paragraph of the “satisfaction” section (page 7) should make clear that service provision was at the health facility and quality of work is actually quality of own work.

6. In the third paragraph of the “implications” section there is a typo (double period in second to last sentence.)

7. In the second sentence of the “further research” section it is not clear what is meant by “need to be given more importance.” Do you mean more attention? Or that it is important that they become the focus of attention?

8. The table headings need to be more descriptive. They should be able to stand alone. For example, for table 1 you could write “Descriptive statistics for a cohort of 228 community health workers in Morogoro Region, Tanzania, DATE”

Discretionary revisions

1. The paper is quite long. I think that the background and the “national context” sections can be tightened.

2. Unless requested by other reviewers/editors, I'm not sure that such a detailed description of latent constructs and factor analysis is needed (paragraph 1 of the methods section). Papers previously published in HRH on job satisfaction have used similar methods.

3. I think that one of the most interesting points arising from this analysis is the seemingly contradictory finding that CHWs are not motivated by financial gain, but that they are strongly dissatisfied with factors related to compensation. While the authors discuss this point and pose very good potential explanations, they are lost in the discussion. I recommend making these points more prominent.

4. In table 1, it is not customary to report both the median and the mean. Reporting one statistic with the range is sufficient.

5. In table 1, where would “living with a partner” fit into the marital status categories? Also, consider “never married” instead of “not married” since you have a “once married” category.

6. In tables 2 and 3, I find it is helpful for readers if you rank each item within a factor in some meaningful order. For example if you ranked them from highest to lowest for either % agreed or the factor loading.

7. Did the surveys ask questions on overall job satisfaction and/or intent to continue as a CHW? If so, it would be very interesting to look at the correlation between these variables and the latent constructs that arose from the PCA.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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