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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting study and I appreciate the opportunity to review. However, I believe that it requires some modification before it is ready for publication.

Major compulsory revisions

The Introduction is too long and needs to be tightened. Given that it is quite long, an introductory paragraph that describes what will be reviewed as background, and why would be beneficial.

The methods were difficult to identify and, as written, are somewhat questionable. The selection criteria seem to have been determined by the cases identified rather than selection criteria determined a priori. Was there a minimum number of articles about a given case required for it to be included? All the inclusion and exclusion criteria should be stated up front. It seems that there may be some value in presenting or at least listing some of the types of programs that have not worked or have not lasted, or are smaller in scale. Maybe some were highly successful but ran out of funding.

The Results also need some direction. A paragraph describing what will be presented for each case would help the reader know what to anticipate. This pattern should be followed as closely as possible for each case.

There is no statement of limitations of the methodology.

The paper would benefit from a quantitative summary of some kind. For example, the authors could assign points for certain characteristics such as retention, longevity, results/impact, motivation of workers, etc.

Table 1 is confusing. The title is not well named and the format is not clear. Some kind of headings might be beneficial other than the authors of the respective items.

Table 2 needs work. I suggest moving the row with the type of model to the top under the name of the case study followed by the working hours row. I also suggest adding the advantages/disadvantages of each type. This may be where a score may be added. Also the table legend should have the definitions of the acronyms.

Minor essential revisions

Finally, there are typographical errors and inconsistencies throughout. CHWs (plural) no matter what acronym is used to reference them, do not have apostrophes (possessive).
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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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