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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

We thank you for your ongoing support and the reviewers for their untiring efforts to assist us in bringing this manuscript up to standard. We hope the following comments meet with your satisfaction.

Response to reviewer’s comments:

Reviewer 2

1. In several areas of the manuscript we have emphasised how our assessment of this specific exercise was intended to also assess the effectiveness of the 6 steps as a message or educational tool.
2. We agree with this point and we have clarified it.
3. Done.
4. Sentence rewritten to clarify.
5. Role of senior management clarified.
6. We have rewritten this part to clarify the question about participation.
7. We have included a paragraph into the Discussion section that addresses the question of validation.
8. We have modified the results section to make it more concise.
9. The order of Tables is corrected.
10. We have removed the table which showed the correlation between on-site evaluation and reevaluation.
11. We have merged age groups of 50-60 and 60+ in the table. Now we don’t have non-representative groups.
12. Confidence intervals were included into Table 3.
13. The Discussion section was completely rewritten to address methodology, validation, findings, limitations, etc.
14. We have addressed the question of the appropriateness of the applied hand hygiene assessment technique in the Discussion section.
15. We have addressed the validation in the Discussion section.

Reviewer 4

1. We agree with this point and have removed all decimal places, rounding to the nearest whole number.
2. We agree and have added this point to the discussion.
3. We merged age groups of 50-60 and 60+ in Table 1, and got rid of non-representative groups.

Finally we’d like to thank again the reviewers for their valuable comments.

The Authors