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Reviewer's report:

The study has a well-defined research question with an appropriate methodology. There was a testable hypothesis, which was implicit in the research objective. The result of the study was to feed an incentive scheme and the choice of attributes and level was from the qualitative study they had conducted in the first phase. The authors should consider the following:

In the background, authors should justify the use/strength of DCE.

In the methodology, the authors commented "During this workshop, various feasible programmatic incentive scheme options were identified" (lines 11-14, page 8). It would be good to understand what method was employed by MST staff at the workshop to arrive at the incentive scheme options.

The methodology should also include more details on the attributes, levels and choice sets used in the questionnaire development. This information should be clear in the methodology without having to refer first to the results section to get clarity.

There is no information on the inclusion criteria used by MST to select CBM ab initio e.g. educational background, other sources of income etc

The individual characteristics of respondents (e.g. age, sex, length of service, etc) should also have been considered in analysis of the choices made to see if they made any impact.

The authors went to great length to select CBMs from different sites based on performance (clinic and CBM) but there was no appreciation of these selections in the results. We cannot tell which groups were better motivated or differences in values of incentive scheme. What was the original basis for the selection?

There was a reference to p&lt;0.05 in the abstract as being statistically significant. This is not evident in the results. Level of significance is also not mentioned in the methods.

The authors in the last paragraph under discussion had addressed issues around uncertainties, validity and generalizability of their study. The study implications and importance were noted. Could the study findings also have been limited by information being gathered/facilitated by MST staff who possibly supervise and provide any existing incentive to the CBMs?
There are a couple of places where unnecessary brackets were used within text e.g line 51, page 5; lines 21/22 page 7.
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