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Reviewer's report:

The authors present a mixed methods study looking at the feasibility of teaching and assessing debriefing techniques for simulation-based training in obstetrics in Bihar, India, a low resource city. To this end, they evaluate the reliability and utility of two separate debriefing assessment tools: the Center for Advanced Pediatric and Perinatal Education (CAPE) tool and the Debriefing Assessment for Simulation in Healthcare (DASH) instrument. As such, this work would add value to the literature, but it requires some revisions before it is ready for publication. Foremost, its claim in the discussion that the flash debrief is effective requires more evidence in the results. In particular, how was its effectiveness demonstrated through the analysis of data and interviews? The qualitative section mentions its usefulness in time constrained situations to help overcome time pressures, but this fact does not equate to effectiveness of the debriefing. In addition, the conclusion that the improved scores of mentor facilitators demonstrated that mentees gained confidence to share with their peers seems like putting the tail before the horse. Instead, the improving debriefing scores demonstrated improved teaching by the mentor facilitators, helping to create the appropriate environment for more discussion and learning. Finally, the conclusion linking the feasibility of the study to improved outcomes seems too much of reach. Rephrasing to emphasize how this work shows improvement in the quality of teaching through better debriefing with its likely concomitant improved learning is suggested.

Other suggested revisions include removing the term "preliminary" as a qualifier for the results, spelling out the meaning for PRONTO and AMANAT, correcting the run-on sentence line 468, explaining why Phase 2 had 0 videos for intermediate and late time points and how phase 1 had intermediate and late time points, further explaining the logic behind the video sampling, and emphasizing more the importance of proper training in tool use (as evidenced by the DASH having 60% of its items with poor correlation due, in part, to inadequate training.
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