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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript that describes the effects of a coaching program on adherence to essential birth practices among nurses and auxiliary nurse midwives. This is a secondary analysis of a cluster RCT and post hoc analysis is declared. I hope that the following comments are useful to the authors.

Title: (Page 1, L4-7) The length of the title is significant and the intent of the manuscript would be much clearer if a more succinct title was provided.

Abstract: (Page 2 L7-49) Notwithstanding the post hoc nature of the analysis, the abstract could be strengthened by provision of an aim/s and objectives. The significant of the study is also not provided and this inclusion is recommended.

Background: The information provided here relates to the trial rather than this study. More context relating to the different cadres of birth attendants is required to make the case for the gap that this study addresses.

Methods: Overall well described. More details on the analysis on the different sources of data is recommended.

Results: This is difficult to assess without the aim and objectives. A significant amount of results tables and figures and supplemental tables are provided. To assist the reader, I would recommend the provision of objectives with strong alignment to focused analysis.

Discussion: Again this is difficult to assess without the aim and objectives.

Limitations: Well-articulated

Conclusions: Appropriate

Table 1 Conventional presentation of data would be preferable
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