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Reviewer's report:

I find this paper much improved with the main issues raised by the set of reviewers now addressed. I still have some concerns about whether or not anything can be said about the relative importance of financial incentives that have not been quantified. Even though the limitation of an unquantified financial incentive is now recognised in the discussion, the inclusion of that finding in the abstract will be all that many users of the research will take on board. I will leave it with the authors as to whether they want to retain that, on reflection, though. I don't think whether or not the government is interested in using financial incentives is relevant to this issue.

I would also caution a little further in relation to the new policy of offering permanent contracts to rural staff. If I and reviewer 3 are correct that permanent contracts are valued because they help facilitate relocation to urban or less difficult postings, this could be catastrophic for rural people and residents of 'difficult' areas. While the paper now recognises 'other benefits attached to permanent contracts', it does not raise this important issue. In Kenya, an 'emergency-hire' project for recruitment of rural staff did not retain most of those staff after they were absorbed into the Government of Kenya public service (ie provided with permanent contracts_ - see Vindigni et al. 2014, this journal: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4003900/pdf/1478-4491-12-16.pdf) Given that the long term impact of this policy has not been assessed, I think it is important to recognise this concern and avoid implying that this would be a good idea for other countries in the absence of evidence beyond the CE.
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