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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions
  The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached.

1. One of the points that I found missing was recommendations for others trying to create the same type of programs a section on things that could have been improved or perhaps things that went wrong or weren’t able to be accomplished would be useful.

2. Something else that would be extremely useful would be background on the country and institutions that implemented this program i.e. infrastructure, previous projects, or experience with Fogarty or the NIH. This again would help others trying to create this type of project to gauge their own abilities to do so.

3. In the discussion or conclusions, a section on plans for the future and discussion on how to continue to fund this project after Fogarty would also be useful.

- Minor Essential Revisions
  The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

1. Introduction, paragraph 2, line 1
   I would add “providing optimal clinical care” as one of the core competencies for medical and public health research.

2. Development of the AMAUTA Global Informatics Research and Training Program in Peru Paragraph 1, line 3
   Here you explain that Univ. San Marcos was a partner in first five years and remains collaborator since 2000, but previously you mentioned that the program started in 2000.

3. Same section paragraph 4, line 4
   “Evaluations of the short courses have been positive (Table 1)” Table 1 shows pre and post test of knowledge in the field, which are not evaluations of the short course. I would re-word this in the text.
4. Same section and line
The next phrase you mention scores of acceptance and usefulness, however, you haven’t mentioned the scale on which they were measured nor the number of participants who responded.

5. Same section and line 5
If follow up evaluations didn’t decline, I would place those scores in Table 1 as well.

6. Same section, paragraph 5, line 2
“Visiting scholars ... are obligated to return to Peru…” I would explain how they are obligated and for how long.

7. Discussion, paragraph 2, last line
“the industry sector..” should be changed to “the industrial sector…”

8. Table 1
You place only the number of participants who completed both pre and post test. I would also add the number of people who attended each of those courses.

- Discretionary Revisions
These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.

1. An opinion on why this project has been successful in retaining fellows in their home country would help other plan strategies for retention.
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