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Reviewer # 1:
Did not recommend any revisions

Reviewer # 2:
Under the methodology, following have been added:

1. period when data was collected has been added
2. duration of completing the questionnaires
3. Aspect of withdraw under ethical consideration

The title has been revised based on what is recommended by the 3rd reviewer.

Reviewer # 3:

2.1. The title has been changed as recommended by this reviewer to “A descriptive study on health workforce performance after decentralisation of health services in Uganda.”

“….under decentralisation” has been replaced by “….after decentralisation..” throughout the text.

2.2. Words like “astounding” and “enormous” has been replaced by simple and fitting words in the text. The 1st and 2nd reviewers thought the text was well edited, however text have undergone another edit.

2.3. Under abstract the second sentence under results has been revised to read as “The health workers take initiatives to be present at work, although the low staffing levels undermine these efforts”. We hope this makes it clearer to the readers.

Under Conclusion in the abstract the last sentence has been reconstructed to read as “This may serve as a motivator for the health workers to improve their performance and that of the health sector” We hope this now clear as to whom this refers to.

2.4 Results

- The percentage 73.5% has been changed to 73.6% after rounding off to the nearest first decimal point.( i.e. 203/276*100 = 73.55%, which after rounding off is 73.6%)
- Last paragraph on page 11. “….likely to take individual initiatives to ensure availability has been rephrased to read “….try their best to be present at work” This is evident in the data presented in table 3 and the preceding presentation of data.
• Similarly the next sentence on same page has been rephrased to read as “The reported high rate of disagreement among health workers regarding adequacy of staffing (table 3) may probably explain…” We hope this makes understandable to the readers.

• On page 12, maldistribution of health workers – The reviewer may has mistakenly confused this with the demographic characteristics under table 1 (location of health facility). However, we were looking at what the health workers reported under table 3, item no 4 which states that “The rural facilities are as well staffed as the urban ones”. To this 80.1% of health workers disagreed. We do not see anything wrong with these corresponding percentages.

• On page 12, second paragraph second last line “...at work” has been inserted.

• On page 13, first paragraph, third line, the word performance has been deleted. The sentence now reads “The workers stressed the importance of having adequate supplies of drugs and equipment to support their productivity”

• On same paragraph page 13, the second last sentence has now been rephrased to read as “This study revealed that some health workers (39.5%) did not seem to understand how their productivity was measured and slightly over fifty percent did not know that there were indicators for measuring productivity”. We hope this is now clear to the readers.

• On page 17, second paragraph, second line “what” before their clients has been deleted.

• On page 17, last paragraph, first line “more” has been deleted.

• On page 18, the sentence has been amended to read “… are positively related to the dimensions of performance”

2.5 & 2.6 The areas for improvement and recommendations have been identified and suggestions made in the second and third paragraphs of the conclusion

2.7. Acknowledgments: amended to read “…the health workers who participated…”

2.8. Captions for Tables 2-9 have been amended as recommended by the 3rd reviewer.

• Also the first decimal point has been consistently recorded in all tables

• Some items in table 4 and table 5 have been edited and made clearer to the reader