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**Reviewer's report:**

- Discretionary Revisions

1. The entire background section (pages 3 and 4) is only one paragraph and needs to be broken up to make reading easier. Additionally in the sentences on page 4 which begin with “With relation to capacity building…” uses a different verb tenses than the rest of the paragraph. The flow of this long paragraph is a little muddled and could be streamlined with a few minor edits.

2. Page 3. Authors state that " ….results were well below expectations." and then note a 19% case detection rate and a 87.4 % treatment success rate, the latter of which would not constitute well below expectations according to DOTS Strategy targets. Then on page 13 you refer to 89% success as a main achievement, this is confusing. (1.6% increase?)

3. Page 6, the titles for the plan that are then further described are different in the first list than they are in the text on the following pages. For example –

   1. Development of a training plan outlining specific strategies, revised or updated job descriptions, and standardized training material and curricula.

   As opposed to

   1. Development of a training strategy, revised job descriptions, and standardized training material and curricula.

   These should be the same for all headings.

4. At the bottom of page 6. Do you mean that you "revised" job descriptions based on a task analysis of activities performed? As it is now, it may be confusing to readers.

5. There are instances where there is some information that can be cut out for instance, at the top of page 9, why is it important to know that the trainees received certificates? This information alone is not necessary.

6. On page 10, point 6. The first sentence reads as a policy guideline rather than a report of the HRD process. I suggest that you reword to make it sound less like a guideline.

7. In the same paragraph, the last sentence does not let the reader know what actually happened with the medical schools, instead the reader is left wanting
more information since this report was written years after 2002, this information should be included.

8. One page 10, in the description of the 2002-2006 plan, you describe the goals and key activities by breaking them down into specific sections:

“…specific targets were set with regards to (i) availability of trained staff for TB control at health centre, district and provincial level; (ii) availability of trained staff for TB control for hospitals; and (iii) the development of a TB component for the curricula in basic training institutions. The key activities listed in the plan were: continue to develop and revise (as necessary) training guidelines, curricula and modules for both pre- and in-service training and education; conduct training needs assessments; ensure annual planning for TB-HRD at all levels; supervise and monitor the implementation for these plans; and develop an information system for monitoring the availability of trained staff at various levels.”

However, the results are divided in a completely manner which is confusing. Why describe the way the plans goals are set up and then have a Results section that describes another set of steps?
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