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The Editor
BioMed Central

Dear Editor,

Please find below the response to the comments made by reviewers of our paper: The Role of Institutions on the Effectiveness of Treatment in the Ghanaian Health Sector.

Reviewer 1

1. How many patients were removed given missing values...this should be reported.
Response: Please see response on page 6.

2. It is still not clear on the data sources for where patient variables are coming from. This needs to be stated explicitly. Is the data on patients coming from hospital records? Medical records?
Response: Please see response highlighted on page 5.

-the authors response that “the exclusion of income was due to an error in the
preparation of the questionnaire”...is not clear. Please revise.
The statement above was not found in the paper so could not respond.
3. 2nd paragraph in results describing where variables came from should be moved to the methods.
Response: Done.

Minor Essential Revisions:
4. References for discussion on role of healthcare workers in teaching hospitals and interactions with patients and decision making.
Response: Done. Please see page 3
5. Reference for last sentence of background: “contrary to the literature....”
Response: Done

6. Add “ethical” prior to approval from the Ghana Health Service on clearance ID....
Response: Done.
7. Add more to the rationale for selecting 100 from larger hospitals, 60-80 from...: was this based on feasibility?
Response: Done and highlighted on last line of page 5.

8. Reference style changes under Sample. Be consistent.
Response: Done.
Response: Done and highlighted on page 7.

10. Again references needed for rationale on informal sector and bearing a higher opportunity cost (in general references needed for 1st paragraph of page 8)
Response: Done

11. What version of SPSS was used?
Response: done

12. First sentence of Results is awkward. Revise to: The average age of patients was 36.6 years. More than half (59%) were women.
Response: done

13. In general, first paragraph of Results can be shortened. The majority of text is
presented in Table so you can just refer to Table.
Response: Done
14. Only report OR’s to two decimal place (e.g., 0.58 rather than 0.576)
Response: done
15. Bold statistically findings in Table 3 so it stands out to the reader.
Response: Done
16. Move Limitations to Discussion section
Response: Done
Discretionary Revisions:
17. Add a map of Ghana outlining regions under study.
Response: done; please see Appendix
18. The authors may want to separate a Results section from the Discussion section. If so, only report OR’s and findings in Results and then interpret findings broadly and in relation to other literature in the Discussion.
Response: Done.
19. Were differences across sites/regions in patient characteristics significantly different?
Response: The study did not focus on such differences.

Reviewer 2

The description of Y as categorical variable should change to ordinal variable.
Response: Done.

The authors would like to thank the reviewers for taking the time to review the study. Their contributions are very much appreciated.