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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Sir/Madam

We wish to thank you very much for all the comments from the review of our manuscript titled:

“Human resource for health reform in peri-urban areas: a cross-sectional study of the impact of policy interventions on healthcare workers in Epworth, Zimbabwe”

In response to all the comments, we have made the following changes to the manuscript:

[REVIEWER ONE]

1. GENERAL COMMENTS

We have revised the aim of the study in the following sections to help avoid redundancy and confusion:

Abstract: sentence starting in line 39

Background: the first sentence in line 104, and in the sentence starting in line 158

Conclusions: line 504

2. SPECIFIC COMMENTS

a.) ABSTRACT
- To avoid self-plagiarism, we have paraphrased the first sentence starting in line 36 so as to make it different from the first sentence starting in line 104 of the background section.
- We have reduced the correlation digits to two decimal places in lines 57, 58, 59, 61, 62 in the abstract.

b.) BACKGROUND

- We have outlined the reform agenda and explained the major policy interventions that were introduced starting in the second sentence starting in line 107 through to line 119.

c.) METHODS AND MATERIALS

- In the first sentence starting in line 173 under the Research Design section, we have clarified our research design and also explained the reason why we used it (justification);

- Starting in line 196 of the qualitative section, we have also explained the reason for using key informant interviews, in-depth interviews, and focus group discussions in data collection;

In the Analysis of findings section starting in line 241, we have explained how qualitative and quantitative data were analysed.

i.) Sample size

- We have clarified that our sample size was calculated from a finite population in the sentence starting in line 207;

- We have corrected the confidence interval to 0.05 in line 223 of the Quantitative section.

- For qualitative data, we have now explained how validity and reliability, and comprehensiveness were addressed in the sentence starting in line 196 of the qualitative section.

d.) DISCUSSION

- To strengthen our discussion, we have included literature on other countries and on implications towards human resource for health reform in sentences starting in lines: 433; 450; 469; 478; 497; 507; 510.
e.) CONCLUSION

- Starting in the first sentence of this section in line 505, we have clarified the basis of our conclusions.

- We have also added a different interpretation of our conclusions and implications for policy in the sentence starting in line 520 right through to line 530. In this section, we have also included implications for future studies in the sentence starting in line 527.

[REVIEWER TWO]

1. BACKGROUND SECTION

- Starting from the first sentence that starts in line 125 of the background section to the sentence ending in line 158 in the last paragraph of the background section, we have explained the context and characteristics of Epworth as a peri-urban area in the second paragraph of the background section. In addition, we have also included two maps for easier reference i.e Fig 1 and Fig 2.

2. ENGLISH

- We have revised the document for English.

We hope that our changes shall meet your favorable consideration.

Yours faithfully

Bernard Hope Taderera