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Reviewer's report:

ABSTRACT:
Title needs to be revised
Result: Please include some statistics and significance etc in the result section.
Conclusion: This is not conclusion these are recommendation as per my understanding. Please revise.

Manuscript:
Methods: What were the selection criteria for these 20 hospitals? This is not random selection; please explain how you did the randomization for to select these 20 hospitals.

Why you have selected the nurses, doctors and administration (Is there any accreditation system like license to practice and valid registration for administration in India?). I think only Physician is the right target audience for this study.

Method of data collection was not clear. Author had approached the study participant through email. This is not recommended for focus group and qualitative findings. As the response rate is 60% which is highly objectionable. I wonder with this response rate, there is big concerned about the validity and replication of this study. There should be at least 80% minimum response rate. Author did focus group another hospital which was not included in the sample and also did an exit interview from another hospital. That might contradict your results. Author has used the robust statistical methods but there is no any relevance has been shown with objectives of the study.

Results: Not matched with the objectives.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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