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Reviewer's report:

General comments: The manuscript has been improved and well edited. Most of the comments of the reviewer are incorporated. The introduction, methods, finding and the discussion sections are well connected. For the authors, Well done for the good work! For further improvement, the following comments and recommendations are provided to the authors:

Objective: CHWs work as community volunteers until they are willing to continue. They are not supposed to have any career paths in the health system. It could be their wish to be educated and work as professional health workers; therefore, this is not considered as career paths. It could be considered as wish, hope, looking for opportunity for development etc, but not as career paths.

Page 21 line 15: It is not necessary to mention the exact percentage in qualitative, better to remove 49%.

Page 22 line 17-19: It is a general statement "… compared to other health professionals who worked alone."It would be better not compare their working style as pairs with professionals; otherwise, the evidence and reference and specification are required.

Page 22, line 42-48. The similarities of CHWs with professional health workers may create a confusion among readers. For example, the authors wrote: "keep an eye on pregnant women and sometimes help with their deliveries similar to a midwife" These similarities are misperception. Midwives don't help the deliveries sometimes, but always assist the deliveries. It would be better to highlight that the community members perceived some similarities between CHWs and professional health workers, and link the perceptions with the quotes.

Page 25, line 21: the traditional health workers may be a common term, it is preferred to use the 'traditional healers' or 'traditional health practitioner/traditional practitioner. It needs to be consistent thought out the manuscript.
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