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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor

We appreciate the reviewers for the constructive comments which we have used to improve the quality of the paper. We have accommodated the comments line by line. We have re-written major portions of the article.

Reviewer: ABDULRAZAQ ESIN

Reviewer’s report:

Comment 1: On the result part of an abstract of the manuscript the word founded was written and it was commented to be changed to found.

Response: We accept the reviewer comment and we have corrected it the manuscript.

Comment 2: In the second sentence of result part of an abstract it was written as “had been exposed to one or more of times with blood.....” and it was commented for making it to be more clear.

Response: we have substituted it by the phrase “had been exposed with blood, once or more times”

Comment 3: On the same paragraph of the third sentence the reviewer comment to delete the first word which was “And”

Response: we have accepted the comment and we have deleted now from the text.

Reviewer comment 4: What is the difference between practice and favourable attitude? How did you measure the attitude in your study?
Response: We first of all would like to appreciate the reviewer's insight and our assumptions was as follows

We assumed that practice is to say whether they practice PEP of HIV effectively or not, i.e. we assessed for example that when they are actually being exposed whether they practice PEP or not but when we say Attitude, we assume how they perceive PEP of HIV. In order to measure the attitude we ask question like “how do you see the importance of PEP?”, “how do you see the importance of PEP guideline”, “what is your opinion on that PEP reduces the likely hood of being infected by HIV after exposure and further infection”, “ do you take PEP if you are exposed?”Etc.

Comment 5: In the first sentence of the background the word “refer to” was commented to be “refer for” by the reviewer.

Response: we have accepted the comment and corrected in the manuscript

Comment 6: In the second paragraph of the first sentence of background we are commented to change the phrase “unpaid and they are potentially exposed to.......” to “working in health care setting.......”

Response: we have accepted the comment and corrected it in the manuscript.

Comment 7: the reviewer commented to provide reference for the first sentence of the second paragraph of the background.

Response: we have accepted the comment and corrected in the manuscript.

Comment 8: On the second sentence of the second paragraph of the background we were commented to delete the word exposure

Response: and we have accepted the comment and corrected in the manuscript.

Comment 9: “Major compulsory” Please revise. The risk is from percutaneous injury such as needle stick and other sharp objects or mucosal contact or non intact skin contaminated with blood, tissue or other fluids.

Response: we have accepted the comment well and corrected in the manuscript.

Comment 10: the first sentence of the third paragraph of the background had been commented to mention other pathogens,

Response: we have accepted the comment and now we have added hepatitis B and C virus

Comment 11: The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of the background: Discretionary revision”. Good to emphasize the place of universal precautions in prevention on transmissions
Response: we have accepted the reviewer’s comment and corrected by modifying the first sentence

Comment 12: The second sentence of the fourth paragraph of the background: Attention or retention??

Response: we understand the reviewer comment but we used the word retention to mean if we provide relevant information about PEP for the HCWs and universal precautions and providing epidemiological data, identifying unsafe practices would help to increase the retention (decrease the turnover of the staffs by decreasing a stress which can occur because of the problem.

Comment 13: In the forth sentence of the fourth paragraph of the background replace" From “ with “Among “and revise the sentence.

Response: we have accepted the comment and replaced “from” with “Among “and revised the sentence and corrected it in the manuscript.

Comment 14: the reviewer commented to make another paragraph from the last two sentences of the fourth paragraph of the background.

Response: we have accepted the comment and made another paragraph from the last two sentences of the fourth paragraph of the background.

Comment 15: we are asked by the reviewer to give a meaning of Kebele
Response: Kebele is the smallest administrative unit of Ethiopia similar to a ward, a neighbourhood or a localized and delimited group of people. It is part of a Woreda (District), which is usually part of a Zone, which in turn are grouped into one of the Regions based on ethno-linguistic communities (or kililoch) that comprise the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia

Comment 16: the reviewer said on the formula of the sample size that he cannot comment on the relevance of the formula.

Response: we mentioned the formula just to show how we had calculated the sample size following the standard statistical formula of calculating the sample size but if it is better not mentioning it, we can delete it from the manuscript.

Comment 17. In the data analysis part Minor essential revision.”Have instead of Had

Response: we have accepted the comment and replaced” Have” instead of “Had” in the manuscript.

Comment 18.:In the first paragraph of the result section, minor essential revision. Spelling error.”ANNESTHETISTS”.Physicians or nurses? Please clarify

Response: we have accepted the comment and corrected it in the manuscript. Regarding the anesthetists they are not both physician and nurses, in our college to be annesthetists there is a first degree programme to train them just
after they finish their high school like nursing and medicine.

Comment 19: In the first paragraph of the result section revise the sentence. Year of service better than service year. Match each year of service with the percentage.

Response: we have accepted the comment and replaced “service year” instead of “Year of service”. And we have also now matched each year of service with the percentage.

Comment 20: in the second paragraph of the result MINOR ESSENTIAL. Language revision for better understanding

Response: we have accepted the comment and now we have made major revision of the language for better understanding.

Comment 21. in the attitude part of the result, Major compulsory revision. This is not appropriate as measures of attitude of respondents toward PEP.

Response: we appreciate the comment of the reviewer and we also understand it well. Our perspective why we select these variables was there are some wrong believes on PEP in its importance because many factors like for example the adverse effects of the drugs. Therefore we planned assess whether this belief is also there in health care workers. And also some people in the study area don’t agree on of the availability of detailed guideline of PEP of HIV and again we planned to check if this also their in health care workers in the study area. And also in another area of the country even though they have good attitude towards PEP of HIV because of misunderstanding and unnecessary fear, they believe to take PEP of HIV in any sharp injury occurs in a situation that doesn’t expose them to HIV. Therefore we planned to check whether this particular belief is their in the health care workers of the area. These were our perspectives to select the variables to measure the attitude of the respondents towards PEP of HIV.

Comment 22: in the attitude part of the result Language revision is required

Response: we have accepted the comment and now we have made major revision of the language for better understanding.

Comment 23: the practice part of the result Major language revision is required

Response: we have accepted the comment and now we have made major revision of the language for better understanding.

Comment 24. In the second paragraph of the first sentence of the discussion, Major compulsory revision. You cannot compare practice and knowledge from different studies.

Response: we have accepted the comment well and now we have brought our data (the percentage) of the knowledge part to compare it with the data of knowledge part of the other study by removing our data which reflect practice.
Comment 25: The last paragraph of the discussion. This paragraph is also a statement of conclusion and recommendations. Kindly harmonize this with your conclusion section.

Response: we have accepted the comment and now we have harmonized the content with the conclusion part.

Comment on Table 2. PREFERABLE TIME TO TAKE PEP? The optimum time is within one hour as correctly quoted in the discussion section paragraph 3 line 3. However, this was not included in the options listed.

Response: we have accepted the comment and we would like to confirm than it is just an error created when the manuscript is written and now we have already corrected it in the manuscript.

Comment on Table 2: Any guidelines, instructions procedure of PEP? This question is not specific. Note also guidelines not guidelines.

Response: we have accepted the comment and now we have corrected in the manuscript.

Comment: Table 3. Listed variables are not true measures of attitude of HCWs towards PEP.

Response: We accepted the comment well. When we translated the variables from the local language (Amharic) to English after data collection we didn’t do it well. Therefore now we have shown the variables to be well translated to English and corrected the name of the variables in the manuscript in the Table 3 in this case it shows better how it can measure attitude of HCWSs.

Reviewer: Beatrice Odongkara Mpora
Reviewers report:
1. The entire paper is full of grammatical errors. The authors need to consult English speakers to help in this.

Response: We accept well the comment and we have consulted a fluent English speaker and revised the paper as per the comments.

2. The methodology used is rather confusing; the authors should describe in details what methods they used for assessing knowledge and attitude stating the scales used.

Response: we have accepted the comment and we have now modified the writings of the methodology part to make it clearer. For example we have added one paragraph which states how we assess the knowledge, attitude and practice.
3. Results section needs to be revised no need of reporting everything in the Table. Mention the most important points and refer the readers to the table

Response: We have accepted the comment well and we have deleted some sentences that are not most important.

Specific comments
Title: 22 words too long. Shorten it. No need of including name of the hospital in the title, country and region’s enough.

Response: We have accepted the comment well and we deleted the name of the hospital and corrected it in the manuscript.

Authors: Include the corresponding author’s full address including telephone contacts.

Response: We have accepted the comment well and now we have included the telephone number of the authors.

Abstract: 336 words, too many reduce to 250 words or less. Correct the grammar and correctly use punctuations. Avoid use of abbreviations without meanings i.e., G.G in methods. Avoid using ambiguous sentences. Delete Out 197 ……

Response: We have accepted the comment well and we have now reduce the words to 244(excluding the key words).we have also corrected the grammar of whole manuscript and used punctuations correctly. We have also deleted unnecessary abbreviations like G.C. And also we have deleted “out of 197” as per the comment from the abstract.

Background: Provide references for every sentence you quote in background and literature review. Rewrite all sentences in second and third paragraphs in background using short and precise sentences, giving references for each

Response: We have accepted the comment well and we have provided references for every sentence. Since the sentences in the second and third paragraph was not written precisely we have now rewritten them as per the comment of the reviewer.

Methods: describe the methods clearly. Sample size calculations methods used not clear. Please state the source. How did you arrive at the final sample size from the first one? Describe systematic sampling methods in details. This is vague in the methods section.

Response: We have accepted the comment well and now we have described the sample size calculation and also clearly we clearly stated the source, how we
arrive at the final sample size from the first and also we have described the systematic sampling method in detail.

Define the study variables in details and how you measured them. How was data sorting, entry and analysis done? By whom? How did you arrive at 70% as a cut off point for assessment of knowledge? How did you assess attitude? Which scale did you use?

Response: we have accepted the comments and the study variables are now mentioned well and also explained well how they are measured, in the data analysis part.

Regarding how we arrive 70% as a cutoff point is:-in most of the assessment tools that helps to measure a particular population about their knowledge, skill and attitude, more than or equal to 70% is considered to be good like. We adopt such assessment tool to be utilized for this research.

To assess the attitude we have asked seven questions which can measure their attitude towards the PEP of HIV and those who have responded well that can show their good attitude for more than or equal to 70% of the questions we considered them to have a favorable attitude.

Results: again do not begin the sentence with out of 197 …. Report only significant figures in sentence and refer the reader to the table i.e., do not write everything in the table as sentences. Write in correct grammar. What are the p values for the results

Response: We have accepted the comments and now we have deleted ‘out of 195 ‘from the first sentence of the result and modified it with other sentences and also now we have only reported significant figures in sentences and referred to the reader the others. We have also written in correct grammar. Regarding the p value of the result, since our research question was only assessing the current knowledge, practice and attitude level of the health care workers we didn’t collect data in such a way that it can help to associate the possible risk factors with the outcome variables.

Tables are too many. Merge them and format to standard table. Remove grids and shades. Consult statistician to do this for you.

Response: We have accepted the comments and since the tables are arranged like one for sociodemography characteristics the others each for knowledge attitude practice so we can’t merge them but we have used now the standard format or making tables. We have also removed grids and shades.

Discussion: consult more literature for discussion

Response we accepted the comment and now we have added additional two literatures for the discussion part.

Use correct grammar.
Response: we have accepted the comment and we have revised the grammar by showing the manuscript to a fluent English speaker.

Delete the section for abbreviation

Response: we have accepted the comment and now we have deleted the section for abbreviation.