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Reviewer’s report:

Major Revisions:

1. As this is a commentary, or a project description, is the use of the “Background, Purpose, Discussion, and Conclusion” format warranted here? If so, shouldn’t there be a ‘Results’ section?

2. First sentence in the abstract – too many ‘and’; it is a run-on sentence. In many other sentences, there is far to frequent use of the term ‘and’, making the read rather poor and sometimes unclear. The manuscript would benefit from a review by a grammatical editor.

3. Sentence 3 – what is ‘capacity’. How is it different from resources or expertise?

4. ‘regulation leadership’ the term regulation is used here as an adjective, this reads poorly. Are they ‘leaders responsible for regulation’ instead perhaps?

5. In ‘conclusions’, are you really able to say that it ‘assists’? It is clear that it is meant to do so, but you might be able to say more with preliminary results and impressions of what it has already done, in more specific terms.

6. More generally, the frequent use of the simple present tense leaves it unclear if something is actually being done, if it has been done, or if it is the aspiration of the program to do so. These need to be clarified.

7. This model is adaptable to other health care cadres and regions struggling with similar workforce challenges. Are there other cadre with the legal and content issues of nursing?

Minor Revisions

1. Sentence 4 – once again, what is this ‘capacity’.

2. Purpose: The purpose of this article - awkward Would be better as: Purpose: To describe

3. The repeated use of the term ‘innovative’ is a bit too self-congratulatory.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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