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Dear Adrian Aldcroft

We wanted to thank you and the reviewers for your time in reviewing our manuscript and the thoughtful suggestions. Enclosed, please find a point-by-point reply to each of the reviewers’ comments. We feel our revised manuscript is improved because of the reviewer’s suggestions and hope you find these changes acceptable.

Thank you.
Response to Olumuyiwa Odusanya:
Thank you very much for your comments. Below we have addressed point by-point all the raised concerns.

Mandatory revisions

1. Methods: were the students who were involved in the pre-test also part of the study. If this is the situation, it is a methodology anomaly and should be stated as a limitation.

Response to Reviewer: It was pretested on a group of 56 students who did not belong to the selected clusters.

2. The ratio of the proportional allocation should be clearly stated to allow readers know if there was any selection bias.

Response to Reviewer:
Out of all the departments with undergraduate programs (11 regular and 4 continuing programs with an average of 4 groups (Year I, II, III, and IV), list of clusters (groups) was established with department and year of study (Eg. Pharmacy year I was one cluster and there were 4 clusters in this department). From the total of 60 clusters in the college 40 clusters were selected. To select these 40 clusters list of cumulative frequencies of number of students was calculated. Then the total number of students was divided by 40 clusters to get the sampling interval. The first cluster was selected randomly. The total sample size was divided proportionately to the selected 40 clusters and to both sexes (male and female). Accordingly males and females were constituted 65% and 35% of the total sample size respectively. Finally a systematic sampling method was used to select males and females from the cluster selected for the study after dividing the cluster in to male and female groups.

3. The authors should clarify if the questionnaire was scored or graded. What was the minimum and maximum and what was average score

Response to Reviewer: In the study 16 ICT knowledge and 11 utilization questions were asked. An average score of the ICT knowledge and utilization was utilized to label the study participant’s as knowledgeable/not knowledgeable and utilized/not utilized. Hence, for the knowledge questions those with score above the average were labeled as knowledgeable and those below were labeled as non knowledgeable.

Minor revisions
1. Results. It may be better if Table 3 shows the bi-variate analysis to allow readers see what where the variables entered into the logistic regression model

**Response to Reviewer:** comment accepted and bivariate analysis included at table 3.

2. The abstract recommends the provision of computer labs. Is this from the finding of the study

**Response to Editor:** Yes, unavailability of computers was mentioned as a reason for poor utilization of ICT and students also recommended availing computers at the college in order to tackle the problem of poor utilization. These findings were also mentioned in the result and discussion section.

3. The authors should provide some information on the training on ICT so readers can have some insight as to the students’ evaluation of the programme.

**Response to Reviewer:** Thank you for the comment. A paragraph motioning the capacity of the department and the Health informatics common course being given to all health science students in the college.

4. The discussion should explore the findings and implications of the data.

**Response to Reviewer:** Thank you for the comment. We identified key issues in the study and tried to discuss in relation to the context in the college and the situation in similar countries.

5. I do not see limitations being discussed

**Response to Reviewer:** A paragraph discussing the limitation of the study is included in the discussion section.

6. The manuscript will benefit from some editorial corrections.

**Response to Reviewer:** The manuscript was given to a native English speaker and made extensive editorial corrections.
Response to comments by NKEIRUKA AMEH

Thank you very much for your comments. Below we have addressed point by-point all the raised concerns.

1. Are the methods appropriate and well described? The methods are not very appropriate as they are not well described. The authors should explain in details how the sampling units were chosen.

   **Response to reviewer:** Out of all the departments with undergraduate programs (11 regular and 4 continuing programs with an average of 4 groups (Year I, II, III, and IV), list of clusters (groups) was established with department and year of study (Eg. Pharmacy year I was one cluster and there were 4 clusters in this department). From the total of 60 clusters in the college 40 clusters were selected. To select these 40 clusters list of cumulative frequencies of number of students was calculated. Then the total number of students was divided by 40 clusters to get the sampling interval. The first cluster was selected randomly. The total sample size was divided proportionately to the selected 40 clusters and to both sexes (male and female). Accordingly males and females were constituted 65% and 35% of the total sample size respectively. Finally a systematic sampling method was used to select males and females from the cluster selected for the study after dividing the cluster into male and female groups.

2. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? No

   **Response to reviewer:** A paragraph discussing the limitation of the study is included in the discussion section.