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Reviewer's report:

Title: A scoping review of training and deployment policies for human resources for health for maternal, newborn, and child health in rural Africa

This is an interesting article on training and deployment policies for human resources for health for maternal, newborn, and child health in rural Africa. The issue addressed in the paper is an important one and timely when one considers the current problems confronting the health systems around the globe and the interest shown by the WHO in the 16 policy recommendation on rural retention issue. My comments relate to methods, findings and discussion sections, especially regarding the provision of more details and overview of review process and further discussion section.

Minor Essential Revision

1.1 Methods:
• Clarify the word “HRH” as it can includes all group of health care personnel, what are the health professional included in the study?
• If it is possible, can the author provide the study framework of what the researcher looking for in this scoping review of 37 articles.
• Is it possible to create the result table providing a list on which paper provide which information? Then, when results are presented, add a table with a list of all references and tick criterion that each paper addresses.
• Clarify the reason to use the paper published more than 10 years

Discretionary revisions

1.1 Discussion part (Part I : Literature review)
• It would be very useful if the author can use the mapping method to analyse the policy existing in the finding with the WHO 16 recommendations for health workforce rural retention.
• Can author discuss the gap of existing policy and challenges or success of these policies.

1.2 Limitation of the study section: Helpful to clarify limitations of the methods employed in the study and limitation of the results of the study, as these are different types of limitations.

.3 Conclusion: It should be more relate to the results finding in this paper and
perhaps provide the insights on the gap of knowledge that need to be further investigate in in-depth analysis as the author mention herewith.

1.4. Background: page 6 first paragraph, line 6 change “weak physical infrastructure” to “poor physical infrastructure”

Discussion part page 6, first bullet, change from modeling to modelling

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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