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Reviewer's report:

The article has been extensively re-worked, but the results are not satisfactory from the point of view of its clarity for the reader. It is evident is that now the article is in essence a double-track text, with a central text and an almost equal (or more) collection of lengthy footnotes, something that contradicts the purpose of a footnote as a brief side comment to a coherent central argument. The original fault of the article, to report a 12-year old field research, proved to be impossible to overcome. The 5th section, reporting the changes in the Rwandan health system tells a story of profound changes affecting the very same microinstitutional factors that the article refers, with expansion of professional supply and many insurance players. I would suggest that perhaps the researchers may conduct a present day focus group discussion and show a before-after comparison. Alternatively they can describe, by using the extensive and interesting framework that they developed, the present-day situation of motivation and attitudes of health workers, referring to the 2005 qualitative study as a comparison.

There are inconsistencies that need to be corrected as well, in wording or arguments such as:

"This study focuses on one country, Rwanda, where health care problems are typical but where the institutional environment is dynamic enough to study changes" (not clear the meaning of this sentence)

"The transcripts were then coded, which means that a label was attributed to each unit of text or quotation, reflecting the underlying content of the topic discussed….. vs. The analysis is carried out in four steps. In a first step all quotes by participants are grouped in more or less homogeneous groups, called 'free nodes'" (discrepancies in verb tenses, methodology is described in past and later in present tense)

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal