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Comments for the review

Full Title: Getting more than "claps": incentive preferences of voluntary community-based mobilisers in Tanzania

General comment:
1. The author used Mixed method design, The paper focused and give more emphasis on qualitative part in the method section and the author should incorporate all components of qualitative and quantitative study components (population, sampling, sample size, data collector, data management, quality assurance, analysis). For qualitative part the author should follow and incorporate "COREQ (Consolidated criteria for Reporting Qualitative research) Checklist" criteria for quantitative part use strobe checklist
2. What kind of mixing is the paper used? the author clearly show, weight, timing and how it was mixed, is that in the result section or analysis section?

Abstract
Method part: How data was managed and how quality was assured? The author should incorporate in the method section, Who collect the data for both quantitative and qualitative?

Background:

1. Line 20 "While many governments are in the process of establishing a formalised cadre of CHWs"
   The idea focus on many governments but the reference focus only in Tanzania(Tanzania TURo. National Community Based Heath Care Strategic Plan 2014-2020. In: Welfare MoHaS, editor. 2014.) It needs additional reference?
2. Line 38 "Motivation can be defined as "an individual's degree of willingness to exert and maintain an effort towards organizational goals" (6, p. 1255)."
   The citation is Vancouver, for further explanation it is possible to see in the reference list, better delete it P.1225
3. Line 56 "Tanzania, Greenspan et al. (2013) found", it seems Harvard style better to use uniform reference style and concentrate on ideas and acknowledge by citation using Vancouver style.

Method
1. Line 53 to 59 "combination a deductive approach, using pre-existing themes based on literature (6, 7) and topic guides, and an inductive approach, which allowed new themes to emerge from the data (14) was used to develop a coding framework."
This means the method of analysis is thematic content analysis not thematic analysis; because the author used the predetermined theory, for content and thematic the new formed team used.

2. Page 9 line 19 "conditional logistic regression models, the sample size is small and 50 is the minimum for a rule of thumb, Did you check model fitness, it needs checking model fitness?

Result
1. Page 13 , Line 33 " During the refection workshop" It is not clear " refection"?
2. Page 14 Line from 46-56 " The univariate models show that an incentive scheme including two T-shirts, a bag and an identity card was preferred over a package with two T-shirts and a bag alone (OR[95%CI] = 1.64[1.28-2.09]). Similarly, respondents showed a clear preference for schemes which include capacity building seminars at least once every two months (OR[95%CI] = 0.42[0.33-0.54])."

It is not clear that the two ideas are different finding the first is aggravating and the second is protective is it possible to say similarly?

3. Page 15 Table three tables " Conditional logistic regression results" tables are self-explanatory by containing, what, why, where and when, better to add them in the title.
4. Page 15 line 33 "1.3E-04" Which one is simply easy to understand for readers? P=0.0013 or 1.3E-04? Better use simple one

Discussion
Better to start summary finding paragraph, Discussion is a deductive approach,
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