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Reviewer’s report:

General comments

The authors are to be commended for bringing this examination of issues around the adequate supply of blood in Ethiopia - and the potential contributing reasons related to knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and practices of local healthcare workers (HCW) - to the international community.

Many KABP surveys have been conducted relating to blood transfusion. The authors do not make it clear how this one adds substantially to the literature, or how the results will be used. This study could certainly be useful as it identifies that knowledge amongst HCWs in Ethiopia is low. Furthermore, interventions could be designed to improve blood donation awareness and knowledge amongst HCWs so that when they are working with the public they can give accurate information to public and to family members and convert family replacement donors to volunteer non-remunerated blood donors. The results could be useful to inform a practice improvement initiative - what should be developed and what interventions designed and tested based on these results? The manuscript could also be improved by comparing and contrasting with other African studies or studies in HCWs.

The manuscript should be revised for clarity and length. Clear, direct expression is best. For example

- (lines 175-176) "..male respondents were found to be 2.59 times more to have good practice towards blood donation than females.." ? good attitude about, have donated, better knowledge?

- (Lines 243-245) "Perhaps, this might be due to the burden of females on involvement of multidirectional activities and their physiologic behaviors." What does this mean? Please clarify.

- (line 240) "There was no significant religious impact seen up on blood donation;" This could perhaps be expressed as—'Religious background of the health care workers did not affect their attitude towards or likelihood of donating blood'.

The paper would be strengthened if some unnecessary information were condensed or removed. This would also allow other relevant information to be presented which could make the findings
Blood donation in Ethiopia is less than required to meet the needs of the population (give details of numbers of units donated per year, type of donations collected (voluntary, non-remunerated blood donors - VNRBD - or replacement or paid donors), whether units are collected at Wolaita Sodo University teaching and referral hospital (WSUTRH) or centrally elsewhere, the population served by WSUTRH, and details of WHO recommendations for what would be an adequate number of units per head of population)

* Health care workers are important in the recruitment of blood donors (give evidence - reference - for this statement)

* Health care worker knowledge about blood donation, attitude towards promoting VNRBD and donation rates (KAP) are important in recruitment of blood donors (give evidence - reference for this statement)

* The survey to establish baseline knowledge of health care workers KAP allows for the development of interventions/education to health care workers that can be delivered and then outcomes (improved health care worker KAP, increased VNRBDs and blood collections) measured.

Additional information about the design of the survey:

* (line 98) "Standard questionnaire (where from?—give reference) which were carefully modified (why and how?) without changing…

* Why were these particular questions selected? Why were only negative results to "What can happen to a blood donor during or after donation" given as response options?

* Was any consideration given to administering the survey nationally in Ethiopia or in similar sized hospitals in other African countries?

* Please explain figure 1 and how and why the sampling techniques were used.

Abstract

This should be shorter, "tighter" and use simple, direct language.

In the Results: Percentage 59.7% is incorrect should be 59.2%. 
The major finding that majority of people do not donate as they have not been asked is not in the abstract.

Introduction

This is too long and needs to be focused on the specific context and reasons for the study in this setting.

Method

Lines 69 - 74 are direct lifts from Wikipedia - not referenced.

How were participants selected? Simple random sampling technique is noted but I am unclear what this means.

A previous study is mentioned (Line 84) but it is unclear which study this is referring to.

Questionnaire was modified from existing examples "from published journals" - which questionnaire/journals and how and why was it modified?

Check spelling of St Ma(r)ry Hospital (Line 100).

Results

What was considered the definition of "Good" knowledge and "Good" practice for the purposes of this study? Should be explicitly stated if possible.

Discussion:

It would be helpful to provide the authors' definition of a good result and a poor result of the survey.

Clarification and concise language in the comparison of this survey's results compared to others in the literature and how this is important in increasing the number of VNRBDs in Ethiopia, Africa and elsewhere would be of interest to an international audience.

Section on ageing population (line 188 - 193) seems out of place as Ethiopia is a very young population and this is probably not the main issue here.

Could propose interventions to address issues.
Conclusion: The survey results need to be put in context of the need for adequate blood collection from VNRBDs in Ethiopia - especially if tied in to an intervention (education, other intervention) or at least a plan for an intervention, and evidence of an increase in blood donations, if available.

References: These lack a consistent style and are not consistent with the requirements of the Journal. Use required, standard format according to the Journal's instructions.

Abbreviations: PEPFAR is included but not used anywhere in the paper. Why?

Other: Was there funding for publication for this survey? And if so, from whom? (?? PEPFAR)
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