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Reviewer's report:

The changes made by the authors have made the paper clearer and stronger. All my recommendations have been addressed. Below are outlined some minor essential revisions.

Minor essential revisions:

Abstract
The results of the focus groups are missing from the abstract, even though they are mentioned in the abstract methods.

“The quality of the data randomly sampled was assessed for comprehensiveness, reliability and accuracy” on page 7 – requires grammatical correction.

“For the comprehensiveness criteria, 103 of the 116 batches were rejected; 88.8% of the batches were evaluated” on page 10 – I think the authors mean 88.8% of the evaluated batches were rejected, not 88.8% of the batches were evaluated?

The sub-heading used on page 10 is “Univariate analysis”. Should this not be “Bivariate analysis” since the authors are exploring the relationship between two variables?

“There were no differences if the health workers received a financial incentive, had the material resources or were supervised over the last six months” on page 11 – add p-values as in this sentence.

Second paragraph on page 11 (beginning with “The average score for perceived self-efficacy varied significantly according to the quality...”) – rephrase or add a first sentence to highlight that this paragraph is examining a different outcome to the preceding paragraph, i.e. batch rejection based on comprehensiveness. At the moment this isn’t clear from the outset, and it is a little confusing.

“In our study, we may consider perceived self-efficacy associated with the quality of the data in spite of the p-value was borderline significant” (page 13) – this sentence requires grammatical correction.

“The type factors identified, such as which are most linked with the human resources as work engagement, self-perceived efficacy, and organizational factors show that the strategies for data quality improvement must focus on
human resources, perhaps more than others resources, which is the approach being used by most developing countries such as Benin” (page 15) – requires grammatical correction.

Table 1 on page 19 – the last p-value has a “*” attached which is not explained in a footnote.

Discretionary revisions:
Currently the results in the abstract are very brief. I think the abstract could be strengthened by including more quantitative results. The methods section could be cut down to accommodate this.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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