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Reviewer's report:

Thanks for addressing my comments. The article is getting there, just a few more suggestions to strengthen elements of it and to better explain how the methods connect.

Abstract

The methodology in the abstract must clearly outline the methods used, not only the interviews. Perhaps you could just identify that 57 interviews with key stakeholders were conducted along with a brief overview of the quantitative elements. When you say mixed methods you must describe the methods used, not just one method, and how they come together to give an overall picture of the issue being explored.

Methods

Page 6

Lines 4-7 again you only describe interviews after identifying it is a mixed method study

Lines 8-9 you need a reference for snowballing as a method

Page 7 You describe that quant analysis was conducted but more detail is still required, how many records from how many schools, what was the analysis process? Later on you mention a pre-tested form, you need to state what this is and then reference where it has been pre-tested. How were retention rates calculated? I think the detail is in Table 2 so maybe refer to this and say how you calculated. Also define what is meant by contractual/volunteer. Also, the reader doesn't know what Type A, Type B is etc. The table needs explaining with text and referring to better. You state you only chose rural sites, but urban sites are referred to in the table. This is slightly confusing, can you clarify?

Page 10-11 I don't think the following quote reflects a lack of transparency, can you ensure the quote's match the points please? 'Nevertheless, others said that the lack of state transparency in
HWF management is a demotivating factor in practicing health services in rural areas. Page 16 line 1 I think the word 'been' should be 'being'

Page 14 I am not sure why gender is brought up here, it is important to mention but if you have not looked at it in this study it would be more relevant to state this in the study limitations.
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