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Manuscript Title: Implementation of infection control in health facilities in Arua district, Uganda: a cross-sectional study

Version: 2 Date 4 March 2015

Reviewer: Jeremy Schwartz

Reviewer’s comments

Major Compulsory Revisions:

Who were the key informants and how did they differ from the HCWs interviewed using the semi-structured questionnaires?

Key informants were senior nursing officers, heads of infection control committees, or health facility in-charges where the committees did not exist. They were not interviewed using the questionnaires but rather answered specific system-related questions such as availability and functionally of infection control committees and capacity of the health units to monitor nosocomial infections. We have indicated this distinction under the sampling procedure and data collection sections.

Did you interview HCW with a questionnaire or did you administer a questionnaire to HCW?

The questionnaires were not self-administered. The data collectors interviewed the HCWs and filled in the questionnaires for them. This explanation has been added under the data collection section.

Did you really use a semi-structured questionnaire? Your questionnaire results imply that the questionnaire was quite structured.
Although 5 of the 49 questions were open-ended, our tool was mostly structured. We have therefore made edits to the manuscript indicating that we used a structured questionnaire (line 214).

Findings from key informants: I was expecting that you would lay out themes, as you implied in your methods, and portray a representative quotation from each theme. I see 2 quotations, no themes, and quite a bit of interpretation within this section.

We have presented the two main themes emerging from the KI interviews and appropriately placed the representative quotes from each.

Data Management and analysis section: There is not enough detail regarding the management and analysis of the qualitative data. "Thematically analysed" is insufficient.

More information about the qualitative data analysis has been added at the end of the data management and analysis section.

Sampling procedure section: This section needs major revision in structure. You do not adequately describe why certain level HCs were purposively selected while others were randomly selected. Stuck in the middle of the section is a lengthy description of each HC level- this would be well-placed in an Appendix.

The larger units (hospitals and HCIVs) were purposively sampled due to their unique characteristics when compared to the smaller units, such as the fact that they could conduct surgeries, admit patients and were generally busier, which factors could increase risk of nosocomial infections. Because they were few, we did not want to exclude neither of the only two hospitals (one government owned and other private-not-for profit) nor the three HCIVs, each of which was in a different sub county .

We had included the description of the HC level as a minor revision request from one of the external reviewers. However, we have removed this.
Minor essential revisions:
Line 63: change "multi-resistant" to "multi-drug resistant"
This has been corrected

Line 73: remove "as"
This has been corrected

Line 74: change to "meta analysis"
This has been corrected

Line 101: change "ministry" to "MOH" as you already defined the abbreviation
This has been corrected

Lines 107: unclear what you mean by "associated factors"- seems misplaced
"Associated factors"- has been deleted

Discretionary revisions:

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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Manuscript Title: Implementation of infection control in health facilities in Arua district, Uganda: a cross-sectional study
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Reviewer: Mareli Claassens

Reviewer's report:
I have no further revisions to suggest.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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