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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory revisions
1. The authors mention in their title that they want to study the knowledge and attitude of primary health care workers with regards to injection safety. The introduction states two objectives, the first one "To determine whether the studied government health facilities of Baglung district satisfy the conditions for safe injections in terms of staff training, availability of sterile injectable equipment and their proper disposal after use" is deviated from the title.

2. The methods state that "Ten primary health care facilities (9 SHP and one PHC) were selected randomly out of 58 primary health care facilities." Please describe the randomization methods here. This description is important because of the 3 PHC, 9 HP and 49 SHP studied, not a single HP was included in the final study.

3. The statistics part is entirely missing. It should be elaborated at least for the quantitative aspect of the study. The means should be accompanied by standard deviations, Stating that "The data was analysed manually by summarizing, tabulating/labelling & presenting in various formats" shows that the results might be merely by chance without actual significance.

4. "However, there remain a number of areas where unsafe practices persists placing HCWs and the community at risk of associated hazards. Training solely dedicated to injection safety, guideline to dispose biomedical waste and policy of monitoring the activity is needed"

With the current study design, I am not sure as to how the authors concluded that.

Minor essential revisions:
Introduction is too long for this research article. You just need to mention what is known on the topic, where are the gaps, what new will your study add and the objectives.

The manuscript should be proof read for linguistic errors, I will just highlight a few.

In the first line of discussion, it should be "The results of our study show....." rather than "The result of our study shows..."
Third line of discussion: "These drugs are distributed free of cost and contain less number of injectables." It should be "lesser" rather than "less".

Sixth line: "Fixed" salary rather than "Fix" salary.

Discretionary revisions
Discussion needs to be re-written. Right now, it appears that discussion is a review article with facts from study thrown in here and there. There is a huge difference between a review article and the discussion section of a research article. They should start with the summary of their findings. In the second paragraph, they should highlight how their findings fit in the wider literature on that topic and what additional knowledge is provided by their study or how it advances the field. This should be followed by the clinical significance of their findings. Then the following paragraphs should have limitations of their study and the last paragraph should have conclusions.

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