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To BMC Health service research journal editors

Subject: Submitting corrected manuscript with feedback points

Hey dear BMC journal editors, how are you doing? we are well. We fully agree with your comments given to us to be incorporated in to our manuscripts. We found them valuable and also we tried to see the whole part based on comments for other similar comments.

For sure, editors, and we all the following investigators tried to edit it starting from the cover page to the annexes by using your comments as pillar.

1. Dr Abera Kumie (MD, MPH, PhD, Associate professor)-He is a PhD coordinator of Addis Ababa University, Environmental health science department head, top editor of Ethiopian biomedical journal. He was the coauthor and immediate advisor. He saw all the comments and saw the whole manuscript again. He tried to edit each part by sharing his scarce time to it. He attached me all his comments and the edited manuscript. I fully agree with his comments since they were basics and tangible.

2. Dr. Thomas syrie (PhD, associate professor, Associate editor of American Biomedical journal): Now, he is a gust researcher at Gondar University, institute of public health. He is now working as editor for Ethiopian Biomedical Journal and Ethical review and approval committee of Gondar University. He is also a consultant and focal person for manuscript edition. He saw my manuscript with your comments and gave me other valuable comments. I went to his office personally and saw the grammatical errors together. Based on those directions, I did it again each and every part.

3. Dr. Gashaw Kebede (BSc, MSc, PhD, Associate professor): He is a senior researcher in Addis Ababa University, Information Science Faculty. He is also a guest lecturer in Kenya and South Africa. He is coauthor and my second advisor. I sent manuscript with comments and he saw it carefully and commented it. He again called me for meeting and we together saw it again. Each comment and other new comments were seen seriously.

4. The manuscript with given comments was also sent to Mr. Zelalem Birhanu, who is a young researcher at Gondar University and has more publications on your site. He did more comments on it and returned it back with his full comments.
Summary of major activities done after comment

1. Your major comment was language editing. The principal investigator together with the above listed senior researcher professors did more to improve its grammar as much as possible. Even, based on my comments, there was two consecutive days training on manuscript preparation for publication by Dr Thomas Syrie to younger researcher staffs. That training was mainly focused on language edition and basic components of effective manuscript. It was one-day presentation and one day practical practice on it.

2. On the cover page, two Doctors that were left mistakenly are added as coauthor since they are my first advisors, editors and have participated in each step of the paper.

3. BMC health service format is strictly followed to prepare this manuscript.

4. Figures, tables & related evidences like questionnaire and observation checklist were uploaded separately from the main document.

5. In this study, source population and study population are the same, because, number of all health care professionals in the study area was 350, which is less than the minimum proposed sample (422). Due to this reason, we negotiated to use all as study sample to increase data quality and it was cost effective/feasible.

6. The Questionnaire prepared by referring related papers, based on objective and variables/conceptual framework of the study.

7. It was self-administered questionnaire

8. Data collecting tool was pretested by taking 10% of the total tool in another hospital out of study area, which has similar in infrastructure.

9. Data was collected by distributing hard copy of the tool face to face to the study participants with the help of data collectors and supervisor.

10. Qualitative data was collected using observation checklist. Its purpose was to support quantitative data. It was mainly focused on observing the infrastructure of hospital and health centers, information seeking activities of health care workers, availability of information sources in the study area. Principal investigator did it for consecutive three days on each facility to see what it looks like.

11. We have also attached the observation checklist and the questionnaire as evidence/ as supplemental materials since one of your editor put it as a comment.
12. All tables are edited/ performed again based on given comments. The analysis part was also revised carefully.

13. The whole paper is revised with great attention together with senior coauthors and peers.

14. We hope it is done as commented and more than that.

NB. Our hope was just to send it early, but it was not happened as expected due to time limitation and internet access. Since September is our new year, every teaching activities, meetings/conferences and business of those senior professors and the like were the main causes for being delay.

NB. The process was completed yesterday afternoon with the negotiation of the two Doctors, but unfortunately, the was no internet services due to server problem in our organization and the whole town, Gondar. Due to that reason, the submission was delayed for one day; we hope you will understand us and accept our excuse.

We would like to your help much!

With regards,

Yours,

Mulusew Andualem on behalf of the other authors