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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The paper contains many examples of inappropriate use of words, bad constructions, capitals, tenses and redundant information. A few examples are provided below. The entire manuscript will need to be revised. In its present form, it is very difficult to read.

- Example of redundancy “Ethical clearance for this study was obtained from Addis Ababa University Medical Faculty Review Committee before starting the actual work. Letter of support was obtained from Addis Ababa administrative health bureau. Informed verbal consent of the heads of each hospital was taken after conducting clear explanation about the purpose, duration and required samples”.

Another example

The first three paragraphs under the "results" section is used to describe materials contained in Table 1 with very little indication why detailed description of the content of the table in the text was critical to better understanding of the results.

- Example of inappropriate construction

"Data were collected by distributing the hard copy of the pretested self-administered questionnaire to health professionals physically/face to face/with the help of data collectors, supervisors and heads of each health facility”

"Pretesting on 10% of the tool was done in St. Pawulos specialized hospital, which is similar in structure, but outside the study to check its validity”

"Three data collectors and two supervisors were participated in data collection”

The entire manuscript will need to be re-written with experienced and professional support to make it suitable for publication.

- Inconsistent use of tenses

e.g. “Knowledge management and experience sharing practices are vital in the health care environment to update health care professionals to deliver quality health care services”

and then a few sentences on,
Common knowledge sharing mechanisms were documents, discussion, lecturing, questioning and answering, conferences, internet, video, audio and other similar media.

Grammatical errors
The entire manuscript will benefit from proofreading. Examples of errors: “Trust on staffs# knowledge, supportive leadership, job satisfaction, motivation, awareness, willingness and resource allocation are…..”

Another example
“Losing experienced health care professionals and their knowledge transfer are crises for hospitals in managing their patients properly”

2. The thrust of the arguments presented relate to the perceptions of respondents on knowledge-sharing with other health care professionals. The manuscript however fails to describe well the nature of knowledge possessed by these respondents, and which they are expected to share. It is therefore not possible to put into context a statement in the results section like "Nearly half, 152 (49.0%) of study participants did information and experience sharing with their staff when needed”

The author needs to describe better the competences of the respondents and in which specific areas of their profession their perceptions relate to.

3. Information is provided in the results section with little or no correlation with the methods as earlier described

e.g. A statement appears in the results as follows: "Factors affecting knowledge sharing practices of health professionals were assessed in three dimensions: individual, organizational and technological. Trusts, awareness, knowledge level, readiness/personal initiation, fear of loss of personal competitiveness, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation were identified factors under individual dimensions"  

What "intrinsic and extrinsic" motivational factors are is not explained in the manuscript.

4. About the abstract
- The background section should indicate the study area
- The abstract can be shortened with deletion of some details e.g. “A one-day training was given for three data collectors and two supervisors”.
- The conclusions in the abstract are not supported by the results presented.

5. The authors should consider changing the tense from the passive to active voice e.g. “A majority, 219 (70.0%) of the respondents had willingness to share their knowledge and experiences”
should be “A majority, 219 (70.0%) of the respondents were willing to share their knowledge and experiences”. This should run through the entire manuscript.

6. The study is intended to serve as “baseline” evidence. No arguments is however advanced to support the fact of how this study will serve as baseline evidence. Baseline evidence for........an intervention? Or because no study has been conducted on this field in Ethiopia?
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