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Dear Editors,

Re: The public sector nursing workforce in Kenya – a county level analysis

We refer to the manuscript titled as above (manuscript ID : 1357645441026332).

Following the comments forwarded from the three peer reviewers of the manuscript, please see below a point-by-point response to the concerns raised.

We hereby re-submit it to the Human Resources for Health journal the manuscript on a study that uses the Kenya Health Workforce Information System to describe the nurses deployed in the public sector that are likely to be inherited by county administrations so as to support their efforts towards health care delivery. The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

The Human Resources for Health journal is most suited for publishing our article as it aims to disseminate research on varied aspects of the health workforce including information, planning and policy, and it particularly welcomes articles concerning health workforce issues in developing countries, which is in line with our study.

The open access policy of the journal further contributes in generating a large knowledge base and interest in the field of human resources for health for all levels of stakeholders concerned. It is our intention that our work be freely available to anyone intending to learn from and contribute in this field.

We trust that the above is in order.

Yours sincerely,

Mabel Wakaba
**Reviewer's Comments (Jean Moore)**

- The reviewer has pointed out that the authors responded adequately to feedback earlier provided by the reviewers.

**Our Response:** No further changes have been made to the manuscript.

---

**Reviewer's Comments (Karen Plager)**

1. There are some minor edits in use/lack of use of commas in the manuscript, but that is left to the editors to work out with the authors.

**Our Response:** We are happy for the editors to guide us in this regard.

2. County boundaries largely reflect historical, political and administrative...’

**Our Response:** The manuscript text has been revised to read ‘...County boundaries largely reflect historical, political and administrative units that are largely influenced by ethnic, geographical and political considerations...’ (Under 'Background' on page 6 part of paragraph 4)

3. ‘Health Workforce Information Systems were provided as of [not at] 2012.’

**Our Response:** The manuscript text has been revised to read ‘De-identified deployment data comprising staff returns and staff details data from the Kenya Health Workforce Information System were provided as of 2012...’ (Under 'Methods' on page 7 part of paragraph 4)

4. The authors' placement of the explanation of the standard of 2.5 per 1000 seems to be a bit awkward/out of place at the end of this paragraph.

**Our Response:** The text referred to has been moved to the end of the 'Background' section of the manuscript, i.e., A widely used health workforce threshold is 2.5/1,000 for doctors, nurses and midwives. Although concentrating on nurses alone in this work, we retain this threshold as a general reference point noting that in the Kenyan health sector there are about 10 nurses for each doctor in the public sector [23].’ (Under 'Background' on page 7 paragraph 3)

---

**Reviewer's Comments (Thomas Ricketts)**

- The reviewer has pointed out that the manuscript has improved much.

**Our Response:** No further changes have been made to the manuscript.