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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor,

Thank you for the consideration and review of our manuscript entitled “Assessment of Knowledge, Attitude and Practice and Associated Factors of Blood Donation among Health Care Workers in Ethiopia: A Cross-sectional study” for possible publication. As per the comments of the editor and reviewers, exhaustive revisions were made. To mention,

As per editor’s comment:

A copy of the Abstract is added in the manuscript file, between the Title Page and Background section (Lines 24-51).

Introduction heading is changed to Background (Line 52).

The text is edited by a native English speaking colleague.

The ethics approval code is mentioned (Lines 294-295).

Figure titles/legends are placed under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References (Lines 326-327). Figure titles/legends are removed from the figure files.

Additional file description is included after figure titles/legends (Lines 328-334).

As per reviewer (1 comment):

Thorough checks for punctuations after sentences was made and corrected accordingly (E.g. Lines 33, 55-57, 73, 86-91, 203, 204, 250, 256, 309, 310, 311 ).
Information about how the knowledge questionnaire was developed by reviewing the questionnaires used by other similar studies and slightly modified to best accompany the outcome of interest (Methods section, Line 133, 134).

It was stated earlier in another approach with the same information and last sample size to be 222. But, now it is rephrased to make it more clear with your suggestion (Methods section, Lines 115-120)

Respondent’s thinking towards the blood donation was assumed as part of attitude measure though not the only measure due to the fact that some members of the society where the study was conducted do have some views which might be against blood donation partly due to their spiritual stands or else due to fear of the possible and/or perceived risks of blood donation. Hence, this parameter was included as blood donation is not always socially accepted especially from the donors’ part.

Limitations of the study is included (Lines 263-266).

Suggestions for further research is made (Conclusion section, Lines 276, 27).

As per reviewer (2 comment:

Thank you for your commend in advance and the issues raised are mentioned hereunder.

What the study adds substantially to the literature or how the results will be used is clearly included and rephrased (Background section, Lines 86, 94)

The study findings are compared and contrasted with other African studies or studies in HCWs (Discussion section, Lines 221, 234, 252, 257)

Sentence clarity issues are revised in-depth as per the comments.

The term “standard questionnaire” was used previously to mean “structured questionnaire” and revised accordingly for clarity and the references where the questionnaire was adopted are described (Methods section, Line 133).

No attempt was made for larger scale consideration to a national study or cross-country type due to shortage of resource.

How and why the sampling techniques were used as depicted in Figure 1 are well explained (Methods section, Lines 121-127).

Percentage 59.7% is corrected to be 59.2% (Abstract section, Line 39)

The leading reason not to donate blood (i.e. not being approached) is included in the abstract (Abstract section, Lines 42, 44)
Long introductory statements are reduced and/or merged (Background section, Lines 55, 64-69)

The abstract is revised to be shorter and simpler as per the recommendation (Abstract section, Lines 27, 28, 33)

“St.Marry” was replaced with “St. Mary” (Methods section, Line 135)

Previous study used for sample size calculation was already included (Which was reference no. 6 but now no.5) (Methods section, Line 113)

Selection of participants was by lottery method once the departmental stratification was secured. It is rephrased now to make it more clear (Methods section, Lines 121-127)

Published journals where our questionnaire was adopted are included (Methods section, Line 134)

What was considered the definition of "Good" knowledge, "Good" practice and others for the purposes of this study is explicitly stated under operational definition section (Methods section, Lines 145-167)

Interventions to address the issues are proposed (Discussion section, Lines 259-262).

Concise language is used in the comparison of our study findings with others (Discussion section, All the highlighted lines)

The statement on ageing was for the sake of comparison but rephrased for the interest of clarity (Lines 214-216)

PEPFAR is included (Lines 75, 76) and was not our research funding agent; rather, is among the support groups for national blood donation programs.

Reference styles are revised as per the Journal's instructions.

There was no funding for publication.

Some parts of the conclusion section are revised (Lines 271-272, 276-277)

Finally, I would like to thank you for your invaluable contribution and consideration of our manuscript for publication.

With Best regards,

Assistant Professor Mebratu Legesse Bekele

Wolaita Sodo, Ethiopia