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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #1: Dear Authors,

First of all many thanks for considering our inputs as reviewers. Certainly it helped to improve your paper.

Comment: There are minor typo errors (for example, use of were instead of where) and thus would recommend a fresh look to resolve these minor errors.

The methods section of your abstract, which is excessively summarized, requires some more information for readers to be clear particularly about how data was collected and analysed (your second statement starts with "Participants used a Likert scale..." which leaves many questions for readers... ) Many thanks and kind regards

Reply: Thank you for extensive and detailed review. We have edited the abstract and body of the text to erase typos and improve clarity.

In the abstract section, we moved the sentence on the number of participants from the results to the methods. We then added the Likert scale values (1-9) and used exact terms (this has also been done throughout the body of the text) to describe the categorization of the Likert scales in the results. We have also clarified text in the abstract conclusion to reflect more accurately the conclusion in the body. The details of the methodology remain the same in the body of the paper.
The conclusion now reads as follows “Outcomes of interest and policy options proposed were rated highly by most stakeholders. This prospect helps to reinforce their usefulness in meeting the expectations of the CHW guideline end-users to properly integrate CHWs into health systems.”

Thank you for the reference to the typos. We corrected as much as we found through the body of the text. The you referred to one in the title and text under figures 2 and 3. We have changed the word from ‘were’ to ‘where’ and moved the same sentence under figure 3. The previous paragraph under figure 3 has now been moved under figure 4. Finally, under implications for research, we have clarified the last sentence to read as “Further research should examine acceptability and feasibility considerations in the context of the application and implementation of the guideline recommendations. Such information could provide evidence for updating the CHW guideline and developing optimal implementation strategies.”