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**Reviewer's report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The method section needs further clarity. It is not clear to the reader if the students entered the room alone or in groups. Later in the paper there is reference to the presence of a junior doctor who had limited engagement in the management of the emergency situation, being in the room, but this is not declared in the method section. There is no reference to the stage of training the students were at.

2. A single junior student midwife and a junior doctor with limited engagement in management of the emergency, in a room alone, present a very unrealistic scenario and this should be acknowledged and explained. Why was a more realistic scenario not adopted?

3. Given that the students voiced concerns that the scenario was unrealistic, the researchers acknowledge an inconsistent approach and the qualitative interviews tended to be led by the researcher rather than the student, the authors need to be very clear about what this paper actually adds to current knowledge.

Minor Essential revisions

4. Page 4, reference 4. The wording suggests that the WHO are stating that PPH is the leading cause of death rather than the authors of reference 4. Also, the reference appears to be a secondary source, rather than a primary reference. Some minor rewording would clarify this.

5. Page 5 reference 6. Reference is made to the CEMACH 2003-5 report. This is a triennial report and later versions are available and it would provide greater validity to the figures quoted, if the latest statistics were used rather than older ones.

6. The students were self selected. The limitation of this as a research method should be acknowledged.

Discretionary Revisions

7. The information in table 2 may be better presented as a graph rather than a table.
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