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Reviewer's report:

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
   Yes, there is much interest and demand as the authors note, for D and I training and such models as this are good to bring to the attention of the D and I community. However, the details of what is involved in this workshop is superficially presented, and there is too much attention paid to the very inadequate evaluation data in the paper.

REVIEW: Major Compulsory Revisions

Framing Suggestions:
Presenting the framework for the training, and giving details on what are the scientific ideas behind each of the activities described in the workshop outline, would be helpful. As it stands as written, the paper is very broad and it is hard to figure out why these topics were selected and what the evidence or expert opinion process was, that led to them.

Are these topics vetted in the D and I literature? Are the experts who picked them locally based and therefore these topics are resonant for the local stakeholders? How can outsiders looking at the workshop topics get a sense for what they included without reading the workshop guide?

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

REVIEW: Major Compulsory Revisions

There are several limitations to the evaluation data.

1. The inclusion of the pre-workshop data in the evaluation sample doesn't make sense. It seems more part of the pre-workshop planning process and does not belong in the evaluation, and the tables should be corrected as they are called ‘workshop participants’ in Table 2.

2. The paper presents a very limited set of evaluation data, for which it is extremely difficult to interpret outcomes for. The sample sizes don't match in abstract and results and this is distracting. There are nested sample sizes that get very small, yet the program is described as having broad reach. Why did the n’s drop off at the time of evaluation? I have made several notes in the text that
highlight areas to explain the evaluation findings. A flow diagram would help.

3. The main goals as stated in one place as: “to extend training reach and foster a local community for D and I”. In another place they are: “The goal was to provide the resources necessary for participants to formulate their own D&I research questions and to incorporate D&I principles into their grant proposals.”. However, it is not clear evaluation outcomes were measured for these. Did anyone write a D and I grant after the workshop?

1. Are the data sound and well controlled?
See above.
See comments above.

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
REVIEW: Major Compulsory Revisions
the numbers are not all matching and need to be verified but seem more or less to match across the paper.

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
yes
. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
REVIEW: Major Compulsory Revisions
no. As stated above, while the workshop conception and content are meaningful, the evaluation data is very limited and it is not clear how much can be understood about the reach and spread from them.

7. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
see comments above

8. Is the writing acceptable?
yes

Please make your report as constructive and detailed as possible in your comments so that authors have the opportunity to overcome any serious deficiencies that you find and please also divide your comments into the following categories:

**Level of interest**: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English**: Acceptable

**Statistical review**: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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