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Reviewer's report:

This article is important in the context of the role of community health workers in UHC and SDGs in many settings, especially developing countries. It is well written and represents a good piece. However, the following are comments for improvement:

- The methodology should clearly state that this is a mixed method study, i.e., both quantitative and qualitative. Limitations of the methodology should be expanded, for instance, lack of wide representation (no respondent from EMR, a region known of adopting CHW experiences) and distant collection of qualitative data (which does not provide for further probing with respondents).

- Presentation of results included some repetitions, and the tables are really long and difficult to follow. Charts are also too many and similar in shape, giving a bit of a boring sense. I suggest that tables and figures be reorganized and represented in an engaging format.

- The discussion section needs more focus on critical analysis, including comparison and contrast with what is written on CHWs. Probably, the paper could also benefit from giving a background here on the guidelines development process and contents. Overall, the discussion section needs to be expanded with reference to literature and deeper interpretation of findings.

- While the conclusion is reasonable, a note should be made suggesting that the final conclusion should be taken cautiously in view of the limitations of the survey and number and type of respondents.
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