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Reviewers Comments – Dr. Elizabeth Owiti
A Scoping Study on Task Shifting; the Case of Uganda
By Dr. Sebastian Olikira Baine and Dr Arabat Kasangaki

A. General Comments

The Research Topic and questions raised are very relevant and the study findings will not only provide input into the policy making in the Ugandan health sector but to the entire sub Saharan Africa (SSA) region which faces human resource for health constraints and have resorted to task shifting.

B. Discretionary Revisions

The qualitative methods used in the study is appropriate and well described, although the authors needs to highlight more linking the thematic content analysis to theoretical framework.

C. Minor Essential Revision:

The data used in the study is sound, however, the authors need to clearly indicate how the data was collected, the level of health care workers that were involved or were interviewed, if the data was also collected from the consumers of health care services. In addition, a part from the open ended interviews that were held, did the authors also used focus group discussions (FGDs) to have an in-depth understanding and validate the issues raised by individual respondents? If yes, how many FGDs were held, what was the size and composition of these FGDs.

The authors list the study populations (mainly institutions) how were the populations selected? Was every member of these institutions involved in the data collection process? If not, how were the samples involved in the data collection process selected? Was it through random or other methods? The authors need to provide motivation for the sample selection methods used.

The Authors need to clearly address the data collections issues raised above.

• Sample size used
• Structures interviews
• FGDs if any
• Random or non-random sampling methodology

The manuscript adheres to the relevant standards of reporting and the discussions and conclusions are well balanced. However, the authors have completely ignored study limitations. There is need for this to be addressed. The writing is acceptable, referencing, the title and abstract content are satisfactory.

Finally, the authors’ responses to the earlier comments are satisfactory.

D. Major Compulsory Revisions
• Limitations of the study should be included.
• Distilled clear policy recommendations
• Rewriting page 12 paragraphs 3 and 4. The last two lines of these paragraphs are repeated.

The paper should be published after the authors address the few issues raised

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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