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Reviewer’s report:

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
3. Are the data sound?
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
9. Is the writing acceptable?

• Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
• Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
• Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Once you have done this, there are also some questions for you to answer, including one that asks your advice on publication. Please remember that it is journal policy to publish work deemed by peer reviewers to be a coherent and sound addition to scientific knowledge and to put less emphasis on interest levels, provided that the research constitutes a useful contribution to the field. Further guidance on these points follows.

Major compulsory revisions:

Background

The current objective of the paper, and where its contribution to the overall field lies, is not specified clearly enough at present. Some increased clarity in the definition of the question posed by the author is required. I would recommend drawing this out more clearly in the background- for example what was the real driver for this study in Ethiopia, the need for it, the purpose to which its results can be put, the motivation and rationale behind conducting it?
It would also be useful for the reader to get some additional context of the studies mentioned in the background.

Methods
There is some lack of clarity in the description of the sampling strategy for this survey. My understanding of the sampling strategy from the text was that it was two stage, with the first stage selected (hospitals) proportional to the number of health professionals registered on an electronic database at all hospitals in Addis, and then a simple random sample of health professionals from within selected hospitals.

However Figure 1 suggests that a fixed fraction (26.6%) of staff from each of the five hospitals was selected.

This requires clarity, in particular because if the survey sampling was multi-stage, this needs to be taken account of in the analysis as otherwise the confidence intervals will be too narrow.

Please specify what the situation was with regards to seeking informed consent from participants (penultimate paragraph of methods).

In the last paragraph of results, it would be useful to the reader to present what approach was taken to modelling e.g. causal or predictive. Specifying more clearly what the main research objective was would also help towards this. For example, was there one factor in particular that was the main exposure of interest and the author aimed to obtain the best un-confounded estimate of this exposure’s association with knowledge sharing practices? Or was this an exploratory analysis- if so please specify how models were built (e.g. forward-fitting, criteria for inclusion, carrying forward to multi-variable etc.).

It is also important to specify which question, or collection of questions shown in table 2 are used to define the outcome.

Results
It seems from table 4 that ITC access is not significant at a 5% level in either crude or adjusted analyses. Please specify whether this was the criteria used to define statistical significance, and if not what was used- or if it is an error, please amend in the results and in the discussion.

The second paragraph under “bivariate and multivariate analysis…” in the results reports a mixture of crude and adjusted odds ratios in relation to what is shown in Table 4.

Minor essential revisions:

Is the last sentence of the first paragraph of the Background “Health care knowledge sharing…” a quote, if so it should be referenced as a quote.

Define acronyms when they first appear e.g. HIRs and ITC.

In the results it would be useful to express Ethiopian Birr as some US dollar equivalent for the relevant year to make comparisons across countries/ settings easier.
There are some small issues of spelling and grammar, e.g. use of “staffs” and correction of these by a fluent/ native English speaker would be beneficial.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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