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Reviewer's report:

Major corrections

This manuscript should be of interest to readers, however, the key area of interest lies in the suggestions about minimisation of needle stick injuries. It is already well known that needles are often reused and inappropriately disposed of.

Recommendations:

- Provide more evidenced suggestions/discussions as to how best to encourage/facilitate minimisation of needle stick injuries, at the "beginning of the systems map.." (i.e. Table 1)

- Provide a table that lists the interviewees by category in two columns (e.g. infection prevention staff - 5). This would enable clarification of how the 28 interviewees were spread between categories

- The validity and reliability of the methods needs to be improved. For example, how were the three HHC agencies chosen and why three? Why 28 interviewees? What were the inclusion and exclusion factors used to conduct the content analysis? Why does the abstract state that 26 interviews were conducted, but the methods states 28?

- In reporting the statements, use codes for the interviewees

- It is unclear as to how the contents of Table 1 were arrived at. This needs to be clarified

- Don't use first person (i.e. don't state "in our previous study..")

- There are some instances where the names of the authors are given for the reference, rather than a number as is the journal style

- In Figs 1 and 2, simply provide the text. The diagrams do not add any value