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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. While the paper is well written, it is a bit difficult to follow because the authors are attempting to address two separate goals in the manuscript – assessment of the psychometric properties of the instrument and evaluation of the implementation of the instrument. The paper needs to be either simplified with the goals more clearly stated or divided into two separate manuscripts.

2. Related to the issue in #1, some of the tables are unnecessary (e.g., Tables 1-3) and the information could be placed in the text.

3. Please define types of facilities (IV, III, II).

4. Why did the authors use principal components analysis instead of confirmatory factor analysis given that the items were expected to fall within particular constructs?

5. Were statistical analyses conducted for the test-retest estimates? It is unclear if test-retest was assessed at the group level or the individual level (the correct way, I believe) using paired t-tests or correlations. Please state the method used and argue for its appropriateness.

6. Elements of discussion points are presented in the results – these should be moved to the discussion (e.g., top of page 16).

7. Please discuss the use of the dependent variable and why it is appropriate to use.

8. Please provide more specifics regarding the types of interventions suggested by the findings (in the Conclusions section).

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Please use principal not principle components.

2. Please use Likert not likert.

3. Please discuss the use of Uganda as a test country – how typical is it? How can the information be used in that specific country.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Please provide more descriptive information of the health center in terms of size, location, types of providers, and patients seen.
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