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We feel delighted for having our manuscript considered to reach this level of the review process. We are also very grateful to the two reviewers for their critical and very constructive comments. Listed below are our detailed responses to the reviewers’ comments.

Reviewer: Behdin Nowrouzi

Comment 1: The authors should specify the type of mixed methods design they have used (e.g., sequential explanatory etc.).

Response: We concur. The type of mixed methods design used is included and highlighted in the revised version of the manuscript on page 5, first paragraph.

Comment 2: The type of qualitative analyzes used should be discussed in the methods section.

Response: We concur. The type of analyzes used is discussed and highlighted in the revised version of the manuscript on pages 7-8.

Reviewer: Olufunmilayo Fawole

Comment 1: Abstract- The background information provided is too lengthy. Rather give more information in the results section.

Response: We concur. Second sentence in the previous version has been deleted and more information given and highlighted in the results section.
Comment 2:
(i) Too lengthy. Delete irrelevancies.

Response: We concur. Irrelevant sentences have been deleted.

(ii) Has a number of grammatical errors, please read and correct.

Response: We concur. The reversed version of the manuscript was sent for thorough language editing by a university qualified language editor with background experience in English academic writing skills.

(iii) The definition of an infected employee should be moved to the Methods Section.

Response: We concur. The definition of an infected employee is now in the Methods Section as suggested.

Comment 3:
(i) The information on latitude and longitude of the study areas can be deleted. Authors can simply describe where they are located in the country (region).

Response: We concur. In the reversed version of the manuscript, the said information has been deleted as suggested.

(ii) What 'nature of activity’ was considered desirable or important? Please explain.

Response: We concur. In the reversed version of the manuscript, nature of activities, which were considered desirable in the context of the study have been described and highlighted on page 5.

(iii) Also explain what you mean by ’workplace with limited access’.

Response: We concur. In the reversed version of the manuscript, workplaces with limited access in the context of the study have been described and highlighted on page 5.

(iv) Please indicate the number of items in the questionnaire. Cite the main literature used to develop the tools.

Response: We concur. The numbers of items in the questionnaires are indicated and main literatures used to develop the tools are cited on page 6.

Comments 4: Results- Why use different categories to describe the number of employees (1st paragraph). Need to recast some sentences because of gram-
mathematical error.

**Response**: Median values have been used instead of different categories to describe the number of employees in each study region. Grammatical errors have been checked by the English language editor. Where appropriate, corrections have been made.

**Comments 5**: Discussion- Needs editing to improve sentences constructed.

**Response**: We concur. Grammatical errors have been checked by the English language editor. Where appropriate, corrections have been made.

**Comment 6**: Conclusion- First two lines irrelevant. Should answer the study research questions. Rewrite.

**Response**: We concur. First two lines deleted in the revised version of the manuscript.

**Comment 7**: Limitations- Should be part of discussion section. Don’t separate. Discussion of the effect of education and references cited should be in the Discussion ‘proper’ and not be so extensively discussed in the limitations.

**Response**: We concur. Limitations are included (and highlighted) in the discussion section (last paragraph) on pages 17-18 of the revised manuscript. The effect of education and the references cited are included (and highlighted) as a separate paragraph under ”health and social support services” in the discussion section on page 17.

**Comment 8**: References- some references are dated

**Response**: Dates removed in all references previously dated.

Kind regards,

T. Kassile
Corresponding Author,