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Response to reviewer Hassan Ba’aqeel

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We feel honoured as your work was one of our references. Corrections have been made as follows:

Title has been revised as recommended: **Antibiotic prophylaxis for caesarean section at a Ugandan hospital: a randomised clinical trial evaluating the effect of administration time on the incidence of post-operative infections**

Abstract has been edited

Background

1.1 Caesarean section rate has been written in recommended was Page 4 lines 12 – 13
1.2 Neonatal outcomes revisited page 5 lines 3 - 5
1.3 Page 5 line 20 rephrased

Methods

2.1 Blinding considered as single as patient was blinded to time of intervention yet investigator was aware even though the observer at follow up was not aware page 6 lines 21 -23
Stated - Emergency caesarean section page 6 lines 13
2.2 Block randomisation explained page 6 lines 17 – 19
2.3 Timing – point of reference used was skin incision so an average time is shown on results
2.4 Outcome definition corrected page 7 lines 1-7
2.5 Primary outcome page 7 lines 9-10

Results

3.1 Timing intervention – point of reference was skin incision so average time in relation to that was considered page 9 lines 16-19
3.2 The time difference was recalculated
3.3 Incidence risk ratio with 95% confidence intervals was calculated so the statement has been corrected

Discussion

It has been revised in accordance to the above corrections.
Response to reviewer Cindy Woods

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript.

The correction has been made on page 8 lines 4-5