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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting paper on an important topic about training nurses to be group facilitators. It is often assumed that nurses can adopt this role as part of their daily work as this small study demonstrates, training provides confidence and competence in managing parenting groups and increases job satisfaction. The study is purely qualitative using focus groups. I think you could strengthen the design and methods by saying more about it as an evaluation approach, e.g. is this a realist evaluation? Since many evaluations use pre and post test measures it would be helpful to justify why you did not use a mixed methods approach and using a tool such as the Facilitation Assessment Scale. Equally, it would be of value to understand why you did not compare the nurses with a group who had not received the training or taken parents' views into consideration. Nonetheless it is useful to understand how unprepared the nurses felt before the training. Some more detail about how you undertook your analysis would also strengthen this section. I like the way you have framed it around self-efficacy theory in the discussion, this would enable future development and testing from a more theory based perspective. I think that with these relatively manageable revisions the paper would be worthy of publication as not enough is documented about group facilitation by nurses and other health workers.
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