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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:

Discussion section:
Better, but still pretty basic and does not read well. (Minor essential revision)
The first paragraph should summarize the most important findings and the authors should highlight what is unique to the author’s approach.

A short paragraph has been inserted at the beginning of the Discussion, to comply with this recommendation.

In general, the authors should be more careful in drawing conclusion from their findings. The authors should not hypothesize too much, e.g. ‘may open a new chapter in the abilities to further decrease health care associated infections’. Given the lack of validation of this approach, this is pure hypothesis.

We have removed the phrase in question.

Although the authors now do a reasonable job in justifying why their approach to assess hand hygiene technique is valid, there is still a huge gap to conclude that passing this test would mean less transmission in the clinical setting. Also, stating that this technique is more valid than culture techniques is a highly questionable statement and should be removed.

We have removed the phrase in question.

We have also did our best to improve the language quality of the manuscript.

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

The Authors