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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting manuscript regarding Rabies Post Exposure Prophylaxis practices in Africa which very few studies like this has been reported in Africa. The study confirmed that only half of patients completed the full course of PEP schedule and the author also explored into detail of the barrier of complete compliance. There were main reasons include the cost or rabies PEP.

I have several comments/suggestions for this manuscript

1) There are some confusions in the manuscript especially the category of PEP compliance. Author use "Any PEP" when the patient did not start the PEP. It should be "No PEP" or "None" not "Any". Other categories were sensible such as 'partial PEP' (two or three doses out of four) and complete PEP (receive full 4-dose schedule). Please revise this in the methodology as well as in the Table.

2) The word "exposition" in the title should be changed to "exposure". The meaning of these two words is not the same.

3) Some data in the result parts; presented as mean and range. It is better to use median (range) or mean +/- SD.
4) The result in Page 8, Line 176 is quite confusing. This paragraph "In rare situation (n=7) involving in total 51 patients, the suspected animal was slaughtered and its heads was sampled. All animal samples were confirmed positive for rabies. That means 7 animals were slaughtered? And these 7 animals bit up to 51 patients? Please clarify and give some detail on the PEP compliance of these 51 patients. It is very important since those 51 patients actually exposed to "confirmed" rabid animal, so they needed complete PEP.

5) Please also mention some limitations of this study. At least this is a single site study, can it extrapolated to rural setting in Senegal or to other countries in Africa?

6) The risk factors that authors analyzed in Table4 were interesting since author aimed to find some associated between those factors and the compliance of PEP. Most parameters were sensible. But I'm not sure about the "Knowledge of the Pasteur Institute of Dakar", why author proposed this factor to be the potential risk factor of poor compliance. And what is the definition of "knowledge" of the Pasteur Institute of Dakar, know the place?, know the service?, etc. Since all patients in this study was enroll in the Pasteur institute.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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