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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. In Page 6, “Eight FITs were supported...“ a description of the acronym FIT is needed.
2. In Page 10, there is a typo in the sentence “English was the most commonly selected language....” Separate the word thiswas.
3. In Page 9, in the second line of results after Phase II, there is a typo “qne”.
4. In Page 17, in section VII, there are two references to box 1. However there is no Box 1 in the paper, instead there is a Figure 2 that corresponds to what the authors are referring to.
5. In page 19, the last sentence in the section of “Persistence of connections” does not express a clear idea or seems to be incomplete and not sustained by the data presented.
6. Throughout the paper there are contradictions in the number of participants for Phase I and II:
   • For example, on page 6, in the last line, 51 participants are reported for Phase 1, but on page 9 in the Results section 62 participants were mentioned.
   • Likewise, on page 11 it is mentioned that 31 alumni participated in the interviews, however in table 1, only 23 were shown.
7. Similarly, there are contradictions throughout the paper on the number of researchers involved:
   • In page 7, in the description of the research team, 5 researches are described: One, a senior faculty member; two, a junior researcher; three, another junior researcher; four a master’s student and five, a recent BA graduate.
   • In the sentence immediately after, six researches were implied: “Four members.... participated in the CCGHR SI... while two had no prior involvement...”.
   • Also in page 9, four researchers are mentioned: “Each of the four researchers....”
   • In the part of the sentence in brackets: “Four members of the research team ........as participants (two as facilitators-in-training, one as facilitator and
co-chair) only three members were described and not the four at the beginning of the sentence. Please describe more clearly the researchers’ involvement in the investigation process.

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

8. In my view, section iv. “Accessing knowledge, opportunities and resources”, (page 14), is not substantiated by the information given to understand the real opportunities and resources for the participants. It seems that what is presented in this section is an extension or corresponds more to section iii.

9. I would have been very interesting to separate de data of SI participants of Canada from that of the developing countries in order to understand who benefitted more from networking in the SI training course and if LMIC alumni benefited from the networking. Networking might have benefitted more partners from Canada than to the rest of participants, as was implied in the paper in page 17. It might be worthwhile exploring further this.

10. The conclusion should include a direct reference to the specific case used for this study (CCGHR annual Summer Institute for New Global Health Researchers.)
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