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Reviewer’s report:

I think that the subject of using a time motion study to assess service delivery of front line health workers (FLHW) in am important topic. In particular, evaluating how FLHW are using their time and are they becoming less efficient and whether or not there is a difference based upon location or cultural groups. The findings from this study will add to the literature in a significant way.

I did not find that in-depth description about how you went about conducting this study to be helpful and did not add to the body of knowledge about how to conduct a time-motion study. It could have been summarized in about half the length and made much clearer about the high level steps that were taken with less about the routine details of conducting a mixed method study and then identify some of the main lessons learned. I somehow expected that there would be some findings. I would recommend that you rework this paper once you have the findings and have a clear and substantive section on methods used. In the future I would include more in the methods on how you did the analysis of the mixed-methods and less about the steps you took doing the various phases of data collection in the field work. Please feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss this in more detail.
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