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Randomized community trial on nosocomial infection control educational module for nurses in public hospitals in Yemen: a study protocol

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS BY THE EDITOR AND REVIEWERS

We appreciate the constructive comments by the editor and reviewers in improving the quality of the manuscript.

The following are the responses to the comments.

Comments by Maria Clara Padoveze, PhD (Reviewer 1):

COMMENTS: General comments: The reference about infections definitions is still not up to date, since new criteria were released from CDC after 2008): no longer considering 1 year, but
90 days for implants; no specific time after discharge.
(https://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/pdfs/pscmanual/9pscricurrent.pdf)

RESPONSE: Thank you for this valuable comment. Based on your recommendation, we have updated the definition of nosocomial infections. Please kindly see:

- Background: Line 3 & 4, p.3.

COMMENTS: The total sample size in each arm, n= 80? It seems that there is a typing mistake.

RESPONSE: Amendments made to the typing mistake. Please see, Sample size calculation: p.8, Line 2.

Comments by Nikolaos Efstathiou (Reviewer 3):

COMMENTS: In the abstract, under methods there is a repetition. You mention that "A three-arm single-blinded randomised..." at the beginning and then at the end you report the same. Delete the last sentence of the methods.

RESPONSE: Thank you for your comment. Based on your recommendation, we have deleted the last sentence of the methods. Please kindly see:

- Methods: Line 12, p.1;

COMMENTS: Under Background, the sentence "Patients with NIs need to stay... or die" needs better articulation.

RESPONSE: We have re-wrote this sentence. Please see: Background, line 4-7, p. 3.

COMMENTS: Under Sample size calculation, correct "As participated nurses..." to 'As participating nurses...'.
RESPONSE: Thank you for this valuable comment. We have corrected the sentence. Please kindly see:


COMMENTS: Under Intervention elements, you report that "in addition, delivering training in small groups makes it more effective training", this sentence needs better articulation and a reference.

RESPONSE: Thank you for this valuable comment. We have revised the paragraph and omitted the sentence. p.10.

COMMENTS: Under Research Instruments, I would suggest to start the sentence providing some more concise information. "The questionnaire was developed... " could be A questionnaire was developed to evaluate (use your objective here to describe what the questionnaire was aiming to do).

RESPONSE: The revision was made accordingly. Please kindly see: - Research Instruments: Line 1, 2 & 3, p.10.

COMMENTS: Under validity and reliability, you mention six expert panels, do you mean six expert panellists? Explain what made them experts.

RESPONSE: Amendments were made accordingly. Please kindly see:

- Validity and reliability: Line 1-4, p.12.

COMMENTS: Under Discussion you refer a lot to the advantage of randomised trials in evaluating effectiveness of new treatments, which is not your focus. Probably instead of treatments use the term interventions.

RESPONSE: Thank you for this comment. Please kindly see: - Discussion: Line 8-13, p.14.

COMMENTS: Ensure that all abbreviations are explained.

RESPONSE: All abbreviations involved in the manuscript were added and explained. Please kindly see:
- List of abbreviations: p.15.

COMMENTS: Proof reading is required to correct some grammar and spelling mistakes and clarify some sentences.

RESPONSE: Proofreading has been carried out.