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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear editors and reviewers

We deeply appreciate your valuable comments. Please find out our responses below, and in the main manuscript all revised texts were presented in red.

- Dr Edith Patouillard's comments
  - Minor essential revisions
    - a. Table 2: review spelling – e.g missing "s" to institutions reference 24—done
    - b. For each section of the Result section: demand for nurses/no of nurses produced in the private sector; production capacity of private nurses education institutions: for those countries where no evidence was available, please state so such that under each section there is an overview/information about of (un)available evidence for each of the 4 countries. For example section production capacity: south Africa is not mentioned – does that imply that there is no evidence? If so, this should be said.—done: line 264-265, 294-295
    - c. Line 333: have key informant interviews be conducted? should those be added in the methods section?—The interview was not done as a part of this literature review. This information was derived from discussion among authors in consultation with senior officers in the Ministry of Public Health. We thus did not include it in the method section of this manuscript. However, to avoid misunderstanding, we already removed the phrase regarding the interview, while still keeping its main message. Please see line 339-340.
  - Discretionary revisions
    - d. Line 389: Can “more data collection required in this area by replaced by “more research” or “more evidence” required in this area? – data collection seems to be a too narrow term for what is implied by the authors—done line 394

- Dr David Gamage's comments
  - Minor reviews
    - Line 46: delete ‘developed’—done
    - Line 70: Substitute ”contribution” with ‘contributions’—done line 69
    - Line 97: Why Resilient and Responsive Health Systems’ acronym does not have a ‘H’—We confirmed that the acronym of this project is ‘RESYST’.
    - Line 122: Substitute “studies countries” with ‘countries studied’—done line 121
    - Line 187: Substitute “institution” with ‘institutions’—done line 186
    - Line 349: Substitute “ward or hospital” with ‘wards or hospitals’—done line 354
    - Line 350: Substitute “closure” with ‘closures’—done line 355
    - Line 360: Substitute “be overriding” with ‘be an overriding’—done line 365
    - Line 422: Substitute “population” with ‘populations’—done line 427
    - Line 424: Delete “also” and add ‘also’ after the word “should”—done line 429

Again, we would like to thank BMC for bestowing us opportunity to learn from you, should any further essential revision is to be made, please kindly let us know. We are looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Best Regards

Jaratdao et al