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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for this article. Overall an important contribution to the understanding of innovations for scaling up family medicine in Africa, which will feed well into the discussion about what a family medicine curriculum in Africa should include.

The purpose of the article seems to be to describe major lessons and observations from the implementation of the GFMP in Sudan.

One might discuss the validity of the methods used for retrieving data for the study. This is not something the article itself discusses. On the other hand, it seems that the paper is meant to primarily present the insights of the “Gezira experience”, and for this purpose such methodology discussion does not seem highly warranted.

The article at times seems somewhat long, and may benefit from shortening, for instance through rephrasing of paragraphs, avoiding repetitions, decreasing the number of subheadings, deleting superlatives, as might all be done during proofreading. Also, the language should be proofread again, and the general use or lack of use of the definite and indefinite articles (the and a/an) critically considered. At times, past and present tense is slightly confusingly mixed, and at times grammar is inconsistent.

In the attached document I have given comments via words track/changes throughout the article. They have been divided as:

MCR: Major Compulsory Revisions (none of these).

MER: Minor Essential Revisions:

DR: Discretionary Revisions

Other questions:
1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

As mentioned in a comment in attached document, it is not entirely clear what the research question of the authors is (what was the concrete objective of the study).

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
The questionnaire, and whether methods were used for validation has not been described in details. Except from this, sufficient details were given.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
See earlier comment concerning methodology

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
I am not able to answer this question for a study such as this.
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
See comments under the “Strengths and weaknesses”-heading

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
See comment in abstract concerning ICT, and the comment about the title concerning the term “observational study”.
7. Is the writing acceptable?
The writing in general is fine and easy to understand. Yet, another proofreading, as mentioned, seems to be warranted.

The article is recommended for publication after appropriate response to comments made.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

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

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests