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Reviewer's report:

I believe my comments from the first review has been adressed properly. After reviewing the manuscript once more I have a comment about suctioning that I think needs to be adressed in the discussion. Is a "retention of skills" in suctioning really relevant or could it even be a weakness if the method described (OJT) support retention of suctioning skills? Several previous studies has demonstrated a reduction of suctioning after HBB training (e.g KC et al, 2017) as attendants move more quickly to ventilation which is the most important step in the protocol (Niermeyer, 2016). This is especially true when using the 2nd edition where suctioning is proposed only if there is an obstruction of the airway after re-positioning to clear the airway to align with latest evidence. Suction is never indicated unless there is a clear obstruction of the airway (ILCOR 2015), not even in meconium stained liquor as stated in the 1st HBB edition. As this change was one of the most important differences between the 1st and 2nd edition I think it would be proper to discuss the results regarding suctioning in the manuscript, especially since the authors used the 1st edition in the training.
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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.
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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.
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