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Reviewer’s report:

In this paper, we found a lot of interesting information about the use of incentives and their link with improving CHW motivation and how the salaried vs volunteer status of CHW’s and gaps in CHW expectations influence this link.

1. The main shortcoming is about the reporting of the methods section. A lot of important and necessary information about the data collection and analysis is missing. For instance:

   - How were the programmes included in this study, selected?
   - How was decided to use an interview or a FGD?
   - Who did the analysis for this study?

There is many more important information missing. I recommend to use the COREQ checklist (Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research). This is a checklist of items that should be included in reports of qualitative research. Revise your manuscript for the items that you have not included yet. You can find the checklist at: http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/coreq/

2. I recommend a revision of the abstract:

   - the objectives of the study must be formulated more clearly in the abstract.
   - when reading the abstract, I had the impression that this study was also a literature review, because the methods section is mentioning a literature review.

3. Line 124: The paper pretends to be able to say something about the performance of the CHW. Is this possible based on those interviews?

4. A thorough discussion about the strength and limitations and about the generalizability of the study results is missing.
5. It would be useful to mention for each quote, if that quote was mentioned in an interview or a FGD.
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