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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written paper of an important education intervention research study conducted in Bihar, India which employs simulation-enhanced nurse mentoring to improve appropriate action and response time among nurses serving key roles in primary health care facilities.

The support of state government leadership and provision of multi-national organization expertise was well described in the submission.

The paper reinforces emerging data that a single intervention, linked to facility infrastructure, however optimally focused and implemented cannot likely lead to meaningful changes in outcomes. The contextual framework is well described and the absence of supportive infrastructure, of critical supplies, timely transport, challenges and task shifting and family expectations all appear to temper modestly positive results with the employment of simulation to nurse mentees.

While no significant changes are reported the methodology of the study was extremely sound and the lessons learned are a significant contribution to the literature.

I recommend this paper for publication.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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