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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting manuscript tried to describe some evidence which is currently lacking by perceived need on what operational factors affect CHW performance with system oriented methods based on authors' conceptual framework. However there are some points need to be addressed by authors to give this manuscript more cogency. First the study setting and intervention parts may be transferred to the BACKGROUND. Then it would be nice to have some description for the questions below to get the clear vison of the research:

1. How field staff classified the CHW team into three level and how the initial categorization reached the consensus?

2. What was the total CHW team number in MNCH?

3. What percentage of CHW teams are categorized into low-performing teams?

4. Why 8 FGDs instead of transcripts from all 12 CHW teams?

5. Have authors identified why lower-performing teams received poor score for 'good relationship with health workers' and for 'strong management and supportive supervision'?

6. Readers may wonder what would be the significant difference between 'good relationship with health workers' and 'strong management and supportive supervision', these two components seem to be mutually not exclusive. These two components had low score in low-performing team, this finding might be due to their similar nature.

7. Is there any chance that the team performance varied depended on the composition of the team? Team performance can be varied due to the internal factors not solely by external factors. Can each team be considered as homogenous group with same short term training?

8. Is there any chance that some CHW team had failed to form the sound group dynamic within its own team from the beginning?

I thank to authors for their efforts trying to fill the gap to better understand the workings of CHW interventions.
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