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Author’s response to reviews:

RESPONSE TO ESSENTIAL COMMENTS IN RESPECT OF OUR MANUSCRIPT CODED: BHSR-D-19-01703R1

1. Trial Registration Number

Response: The statements relating to Trial registration number have been appropriately deleted in the revised manuscript. See the abstract section, page 3, line 63-64 for the deleted statements.

2. List of abbreviations

Response: All the abbreviations used in our study have been appropriately defined and included in the revised manuscript. See page 18/19, line 451-457 for the inclusion.

3. Ethics approval and consent to participate

Response: Verbal informed consent was approved for our study by the Ethics committee. This is largely because, the study is strictly a questionnaire-based survey with questions carefully designed without infringement on participants privacy. Also, the questionnaire and informed consent form for the patients were duly translated into the local language of the patients (i.e. Yoruba) for proper comprehension. The informed consent form in the approved protocol, which captured the consent information including objectives and procedure of the study, maleficence (risks) and beneficence (benefits) of participation, voluntariness of participation, as well as expected duration of involvement among others, was read and explained to individual participant prior to questionnaire administration. Subsequently, verbal informed consent was obtained from every participant to signify their intention for participation. See the method section, page 8, line 180-185; line 190-192, also page 19, under declarations, line 464-471 for the clarifications and inclusions.
4. Interview Guides

Response: The interview guide i.e. the item-statements in our study questionnaires were purposely designed for our study and were developed by us the investigators, based on our previous practice experience in the field. Though, review of relevant/related studies or documents also help to guide and expand our thoughts during the development of the questionnaires for the health worker and the patient. The question-items in our questionnaires have not been previously published elsewhere.

5. Additional files

Response: A sub-section of additional files has been appropriately included in the revised manuscript. See page 24, line 595-596 in the revised manuscript for the inclusion.

Also, ‘additional file has been appropriately inserted in the main text of the revised manuscript. See the method section, page 7, line 161 for the inclusion.

In addition, the cover letter has been appropriately removed in the resubmission of the revised manuscript. See the re-submitted documents for clarifications.

6. Formatting

Response: The comment in this regard in relation to conclusions has been appropriately effected. See the abstract section, page 3, line 56; also page 18, line 440 of the main text in the revised manuscript for the corrections.

7. Clean manuscript

Response: A single clean version of the revised manuscript is now attached. Also, all the relevant tables and additional file have been inserted in the appropriate subsections throughout the revised manuscript. See the method section, page 7, line 161; also the results section, lines 227, 235, 250, 259, 279, 288, 296 for the insertions.

Thank you.