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Reviewer’s report:

The article "Physicians' knowledge and attitudes concerning antibiotic resistance: a survey in a Ghanaian Tertiary care Hospital" aimed to investigate physicians' knowledge and attitudes towards antibiotic resistance in a tertiary-care hospital setting in Ghana. This paper investigates an important issue, in a context that lacks of strong scientific evidences on this topic. However, the paper could be suitable for publication only after major revisions. Specifically:

1. The main weakness of this study is that it is not well written. There are several grammar mistakes, spelling errors and many sentences that are unclear and difficult to understand, and this makes difficult to estimate the overall quality of the paper. I provided few examples below. I suggest to carefully check the whole paper and/or to send it to a language editing service.

Other revisions:

Abstract:

2. Page 2, lines 13-14: "sampling" should maybe be replaced with "survey".

3. Page 2, lines 23-26: "of physicians" is repeated two times.

4. Page 2, lines 30 -33: the sentence "the commonest and cause of antibiotic resistance" is not clear.

5. Page 2, lines 57-58: the sentence "the likehood to underestimate the problem in their own unit or department" is not clear.

Introduction:

6. Page 3, lines 2-10: the first three sentences of the introduction are very similar. I suggest to combine them in one or two sentences.

7. Please uniform the way you cite the references. In the same paragraph you cited studies in two different ways: [8][9][10][11] and [21-24].
Methodology:

8. Please include the sentence "data not shown" when you did not include in a table or a figure the data that you described.

9. Page 6, lines 29-30: you stated that you counted 171 physicians eligible to participate in your study, but in the results section you declared that the survey was completed by 159 out of 200 physicians. Could you please explain this discrepancy?

10. Page 7, line 39: the two lists (ESBL>MRSA>VRE>CRE or ESBL>MRSA>VRE>CRE) are the same, I think it is a mistake.

11. Page 8 lines 29-30. I personally believe that you should explain what do you mean with "house officer", because this term could refer to different types of physicians in different countries.

Results:

12. Page 9, lines 31-32: the word "regarded" is not appropriate.

13. Page 10, line 44: you missed the symbol "%"

14. Page 11, lines 24-32: this sentence is not clear, I think that you forgot to write "senior" in lines 24.

15. Page 11, line 44: the meaning of the paragraph "senior versus junior physicians" is not very clear to me. Specifically, why did you include in your model the variable "senior or junior physician" as dependent (outcome) variable? The outcome of your study is not to evaluate potential predictors of being a senior or a junior physician, but to evaluate knowledge, attitudes and practices of physicians.

Discussion:

16. Page 13, lines 35-36: the sentence "these findings are at variance with those from a Brazilian study" is not clear to me.

17. Page 14, lines 5-8: the sentence "This (these) findings if true, bodes well for attempts at controlling antibiotic resistance in the hospital" is not clear.

18. Page 14, lines 53-54: I think you should delete the word "not" from this sentence.

Tables and figures:
19. Page 23, table 1: I personally believe that the first part of table 1 is not useful, and that table should start with the of the different hospital departments involved. Alternatively, table 1 can be divided in two tables. Moreover, I do not understand why in the line "type of hospital" it is written that respondents are 156, and in the line "hospital department" the respondents are 159.

20. Page 24, table 2: please carefully check the formatting of this table - specifically, delete the suspension points and include the whole sentences.

References:

21. Please check carefully the formatting of the references.
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