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Reviewer's report:

This paper is improved. I think the authors could go still deeper on the suggestions by both reviewers and extensively revise the paper for flow. There is truly important information in this paper, and more could be done here to help ensure this information is actually used to improve trainings of health workers in Nigeria.

1. I am still really looking for a deeper analysis in the discussion, one that does not re-state what has already been said in the results but truly addresses problems of resource scarcity and accountability, drawing on the focus group data. The discussion is improved but does not really go deeper than what has already been presented.

The remainder of my suggestions focus on writing:

2. The writing needs editing before it is of publishable quality. Many paragraphs consist of just one sentence, there is missing punctuation, and capitalization is inconsistent. Perhaps this is a result of the pdf conversion process, but there is very confusing spacing and paragraph breaks.

3. The discussion of the Nigerian context of immunization services in the introduction is much improved. It could use editing for flow. For example:

   a. The introduction of Gavi on p. 2, line 55 could be smoother

   b. The discussion of the size of the health workforce on p. 3, lines 12-16 and 23-25 should be integrated. Currently, it jumps around a bit.

   c. I would like a bit more information on the problems listed on p. 3, lines 19-23, as those are so integral to the issues discussed in the paper.

4. The additional background on training in Nigeria is much appreciated. This too could be edited for flow. For example:
a. P. 4, lines 31-32: I would delete the Rwanda example. There is a LOT that is different between the Rwandan and northern Nigerian health systems, planning is just one small piece of that.

b. As in the rest of the paper, this section should be edited for flow.

5. Sections of the methods were confusing. These include:

a. An explanation of the cadres of workers (CHOs, CHEWs, etc) would be helpful, since we are just given their acronyms without explanation of who they are and what they do.

b. Many acronyms are presented but not spelled out or explained (eg., TNA)

c. Ethical and administrative approval are not necessarily the same thing; perhaps they should be presented separately.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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