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To BMC health service editors

Subject: Page by page feedbacks for the given comments

1. BMC health service research manuscript format is strictly followed.

2. In the title page, two responsible coauthors; Dr. Abera Kumie and Dr. Gashaw Kebede are added since they are my advisors and participated in each activities.

3. Copy editing or language editing was done for all pages using senior editors and researchers:
   - Dr Thomas (PhD, Associate professor, American public health journal editor), now he is working as guest lecturer, Ethiopian Biomedical Journal editor and Ethical review committee in Gondar University.
   - Dr. Abera Kumie (MD, MPH, PhD, Associate professor) who is a PhD coordinator for Addis Ababa University, Environmental Health Science department head and senior editor for Ethiopian Biomedical journal.
   - Dr. Gashaw Kebede (BSc, MSc, PhD, Associate professor) who is also a senior researcher in Addis Ababa University Information science faculty and a guest lecturer and advisor in South Africa and Kenya.
   - In addition, I invited the younger researcher Mr. Zelalem Birhanu who is reproductive health department head, Member of Ethical review comment tee of Gondar University and young energetic researcher who have more publication on your website.

   NB. All the above individuals tried to edit the language and examine each part based on your comments and experiences as much as possible together with the principal investigator. The major editing activities compared to the previous manuscript are:

   ✓ Word selection,
   ✓ Sentence construction (grammar or subject verb agreements),
   ✓ Using appropriate tenses,
   ✓ Avoiding using vague words,
   ✓ Avoiding using long sentences,
   ✓ Minimizing the application of conjunction by using short sentences,
   ✓ Applying the principle of one sentence for one idea,
   ✓ As much as possible great effort was done not to use more than 20 words per sentence for most of the time.

4. An Abstract is edited much for language and content especially methodology and conclusion.
5. The study population, sample and source population for this research were the same. Because, the minimum required proposed sample for this research was 422, but the actual number of health professionals in the study area was 350 (270 from hospital and 80 from 4 health centers). Therefore, the principal investigator with his advisors decided to include all health professionals working there as census since it was feasible. That is why study population and inclusion-exclusion criteria were the same. For that matter, I excluded inclusion and exclusion part now (page 5, methodology, paragraph 2).

6. Questionnaire was developed by referring related papers from various databases via internet by taking study objective, methods and study variables as benchmarking. Pretesting was done on 10% of the tool at Debre markos Zonal hospital which is out of study area, but similar in infrastructures. Principal investigator did it before one week of actual data collection date to check its validity. Simple random sampling technique was applied to select staffs for pretesting (page 5, methodology, paragraph 3).

7. Data were collected by distributing the hard copy of the instruments to health care professionals physically/face-face/ with the help of data collectors, supervisor and heads of each health facilities. (page 6, methodology, paragraph 2). Reasons for none respondents were collected while the respondents or their friends returning back the uncompleted questionnaire to the data collectors after 3-4 days of questionnaire distribution. When data collectors went to there for returning the questionnaire, they gave these comments with uncompleted tool (page 7, Result, paragraph 1, last three sentences).

8. Qualitative data was collected to support quantitative data using none participatory method via observation check lists. The tool was prepared based on study objectives and variables by referring related studies. It was mainly focused on observing infrastructures of health facilities, day-to-day information searching activities of health professionals, Information sharing activities of health professionals and availability of health information resources like library, internet, books, etc. Principal investigator did it for three consecutive days after quantitative data collection. The tool is attached as supplementary material for this manuscript based on your comment (page 6, methodology, paragraph 3).
There was only one mini library in the hospital. It was so narrow (4x4cm) and has eight desktops (only six were functional) with weak wireless internet connection. Library personnel limited the maximum time as 30 minutes for one individual at a time on one computer so as to give chance for other users. Six to eight health professionals were observed using internet (e-mail and chat). Most of them (90%) were young General Practitioners (GPs) with the approximate age group of 27-30 years. Observation period was for three consecutive days to see what the real situation looks like there (page 9, Result, last paragraph).

The analysis was revised again and seen from various angles and no more modification was given from my coauthors and reviewers (from the above listed senior researchers), but result-presenting mechanisms (tables, figures) and language were edited more (all tables at figure and table section).

Every table and figure is cited within each paragraph throughout the whole manuscript since it was my comment given from your associate editors (all part of the manuscript).

Figures and tables are uploaded separately from the main manuscript, which was also my given comment (figure and table part).

Figures and tables were put according to their order of reference on the manuscript (figure and table part)

Table /figure number and names were removed from being attached with tables and figures, which was also my comment from you (figure and table part).

Figure and table number and names are put at the last page or after reference page based on your comments (page 17, last paragraph).

Observation check list tool is uploaded as additional supplementary material for this manuscript, because it was comment from one of your editor.