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Author's response to reviews:

27th March 2009

To,
The Editor-In-Chief,
The BioMed Central Infectious Diseases Journal

Subject: Resubmission of revised manuscript (MS: 1429274387248686) entitled “Impact of infection control activities on the rate of needle stick injuries at a tertiary care hospital of Pakistan over a period of six years: an observational study.”

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your communication. We appreciate the comments of the reviewers. As per their advice we have addressed the issues and made changes in the manuscript accordingly. Details as given below:

Reviewer#1:
1. Suggestion: The details of the “education programmes” should be detailed and whether all the health care workers attended to these programmes should be detailed i.e. Percentage of the “educated” staff for each group.
Correction: As per suggestion, detail of education program has been added in 4th and 5th paragraph of methods as well as in table 1.

2. Suggestion: The meaning of "CI" in Table 1 should be clarified.
Correction: Clarified as per instruction. In the revised version it is Table 2a.
3. Suggestion: The meaning of "p values" in Table 2 should be clarified. 
Correction: This issue has been corrected and is now Table 3.

Reviewer #2:
1. Suggestion: “However, the design of the study was not “an interventional prospective study” announced in the title! Title is not adapted because the design used couldn’t measure the “impact” of this intervention. It’s an observational study without control group so their conclusion should be moderated”.
Correction: Changes have been made in the title as per suggestion.

2. Suggestion: Concerning the method used, more precisions are necessary on:
   - Collection of Nis
   - Types of intervention included in this “multifaceted educational approach” brochure, lecture, course, hands on training sessions, feed-back of the NI survey??
   - Number or proportion of HCWS trained in the different categories.
   - Implementation of standard precautions in this hospital: when and how, what about compliance to these measures ??
Correction: Thanks for suggestions, all information regarding these issues have been added. Kindly look into paragraph number 2, 4 and 5 in the section of methods. It is also elaborated in Table number 1.

3. Suggestion: Results should be completed:
   - It would be interesting if the authors could examine the data in terms of “Injuries/exposures prevented” = incidence by number of venipuncture and per year for example (or number of surgery…) and see where the decreased occurred significantly (suggesting a place where educational efforts may be most effective). Or expressed as NI per 100 full-time employment-years by high risk personnel and not only in number of NI in each categories of HCW as presented in table 3 (and not table II).
Correction: Thanks for the suggestions, we made changes in the text as well as introduced new table 2b. For high risk personnel’s (sustaining higher number of NSIs) such as doctors and nurses, NSI/100 FT was calculated. It is given in the last few lines in first paragraph of result and also in Table 2b.

4. Suggestion: The study period ranged from 2002 to 2007, why Fig 1 showed data on 2001 and why there is no data for 2007 in table 2.
Correction: Year 2001 was transcriptional error and correction has been made in figure 1. We were not able to retrieve the data of 2007 which was given in Table 2 previously but in revised version it is Table 3.

5. Suggestion: There is no statistical comparison between the incidence of NI between the first and the second period studied (before end after 2005).
Correction: Correction made and detail is given in last three lines of first paragraph of results.

6. Suggestion: -The relative proportion of injuries by activities presented in Figure 1 (tile not adapted)
Correction: Issue addressed and title changed

7. Suggestion: - In the abstract, the result section should be focused on the main result and not on the comparison it’s not clear.
Correction: Issue has been addressed and results are also added in the abstract

8. Suggestion: Some points should be discussed
- What about under reporting from the different HCWs categories? These could be explained the proportion of Nis reported by doctors or medical student?
- The educational program appeared to have positive impact on reducing recapping injuries and doctors but many other NIs did not change significantly. How that could be explained? This should be discussed.
Correction: Issue of underreporting has been addressed in last 5 lines of paragraph number 2 in discussion.
Issue of recapping was addressed in last few lines of paragraph number 6 in discussion.

Editor:
1. Comment: The authors states that “By relating and comparing the rates of year 2002 and 2006..” Do they mean when adjusting for factors listed, there was a ..........what statistical test was used?
Correction: For statistical analysis Chi square test was used and is added in the last paragraph of methods

2. Comment: Revision of English
Correction: As per instruction revised version is edited by native English speaking person.

We think we have made changes as per instruction of reviewers and look forward for a positive response

Kind regards,

Afia Zafar