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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions

1. Although the paper is much improved there remain some difficulties with English expression that make it difficult for the reader to follow the argument

Abstract: Last para. "monitor risk[s]"... "to improve occupational [health] in Kabul"

Introduction: Para 1. "contact with body non-intact skin.." (needs rewrite)

Para 2. "health workers ranges [should be ranging] from 6%..."

para 3 Last sentece is not clear

Methods

Para 1 Ministry of Public Health - not ministry of public health etc.

A close read by a native English speaker would be most useful.

2. Data Presentation

Table 1 should include variation by age as this is noted in the text. In addition, the table refers to vaccination status but the text only refers to "the experience" - this should be changed to "vaccination status"

The text refering to Table 2 and the data in Table 2 do not always agree. For example, in the text it states that 70% of health care workers thought universal precautions applied to patients with HIV and hepatitis only. The way the data are presented in the table it appears that 70% were correct in their responses ie 70% new that univeral precautions applied to all patients - a contradiction to the way it is presented in the text. Similar confusion appears with the re-capping of needles.

The conclusion also includes confusion statements eg that 2/3rds of helath care workers consider that universal precautions are necessary in situations that lead to contact with saliva. Careful attention needs to be paid to the data included in the table and the text used to describe these data.

Minor essential revisions

In the reference list, at times the authors include the issue number as well as the
volume number. In other instances only the volume number is included. A consistent approach to referencing is ideal.

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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