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Reviewer's report:

The authors’ effort to document experience of providers with UBT is appreciated. However, the study is not appropriately situated as a piece of research in two ways: there is a body of literature on clinical skills training and attainment of competence; also there is a body of literature on interventions for PPH in low resource settings and how contextual factors in the service might influence the applicability of a particular intervention alongside others such as NASG and tranexamic acid. Both these areas of knowledge are overlooked in the manuscript and references. The introduction and discussion are mostly about the benefits of UBT not about the issues of attaining and maintaining competency, or how UBT fits in to care amid the particular constraints of Dar hospitals.

The authors could usefully revise the manuscript using the raw material they have, placing the work more appropriately so as to show relevant insights about skills training and about PPH management. They could even draw on some of their other papers that are cited but not really used in the discussion to illuminate the influence of context and service setting.

An aspect that might be illuminated further is the 'fear of blame' identified in the interviews. In this reviewer's current practice setting there are deep reservations among colleagues about UBT owing to the non availability of rapid recourse to blood transfusion and hysterectomy should conservative steps such as UBT fail- whereas in other settings one is more comfortable to deploy UBT knowing that rapid access to surgery is available should it fail. Thus clinicians are likely to make their own judgements of what is 'blame worthy' based on their knowledge of the consequences for patients in their particular setting. This would be an interesting area to explore further.

The referencing is rather selective eg not including the Dumont study.

The abstract Conclusion statement that "The ESM-UBT device is effective in arresting PPH" is un related to this work, which is not about the efficacy of UBT.

Minor style point: women are not 'diagnosed with PPH', the diagnosis applies to the condition, eg 'a diagnosis of PPH was made in .... women'

Are the methods appropriate and well described? 
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**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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