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Reviewer Report

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

Version: 3

Date: 17 April 2015

Reviewer: Jeremy Schwartz

Reviewer’s comments

Minor essential revisions:

Line 66: C Diff is not the most common cause of antibiotic-associated diarrhea

Response: This has been corrected to indicate that \textit{C. difficile} is the commonest cause of nosocomial infectious diarrhea but not the commonest antibiotic-associated diarrhea.

Line 167: Correct “who was has been selected”

Response: This grammatical error has been corrected

Line 182: need a comma following “five years)”

Response: The comma has been added

The sentence that goes from line 185 to line 199 is much too long and interrupted by too many parentheses. I wonder if this comprehensive list would be better suited for a table?

Response: The sentence has been replaced with a table.

Line 225: “data base” should be “database”

Response: This has been corrected as suggested above
Findings from key informants: You report only 2 themes. Is this true? And you only report 2 representative quotations. I find myself wanting more justification for these 3 themes. Plus, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} theme contains 3 sub-themes.

**Response:** We have reduced the number of subthemes under theme “availability of resources to implement infection control measures” from three to two and added a third theme on “capacity of healthcare workers to implement infection control measures.” We have also added three more representative quotations.

Figure 1: I still question the usefulness of Figure 1. Number approached and number consented is equivalent throughout.

**Response:** This was a comment from one of the reviewers but we also thought it wasn’t so informative. We have removed the figure.

**Discretionary revisions:**
Line 72: change “especially” to “such as”

**Response:** This has been corrected

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests.

**Note:** I have also made additional discretionary revisions by abbreviating healthcare workers to HCWs and clarifying on the number of HCWs that were interviewed in the abstract section.