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Author’s response to reviews:

To editors only:

We are very willing to work with the editors to address the issue of our theoretical approach/use of the term ethnographic; however, as stated in the response below, we are not comfortable calling our theoretical approach anything other than ethnographic since that was how the study was designed. We understand the reviewer's concerns regarding calling the presentation of data and findings in this particular manuscript ethnographic, but then we would need to simply call it a qualitative study based on semi-structured interviews and attempt to isolate the particular method (semi-structured interviews) that were the basis of this manuscript. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Response to reviewers:
1) Thematic headings need further clarification and description. In relation to the comment made by one of the reviewers the thematic analysis particularly the headings should be more specific to the content rather the generic headings chosen in which the meaning is more developed and explicit (see comments) 'Was the analysis approach thematic analysis (Braan and Clarke)’

We have further clarified and described the subthemes in the manuscript, particularly closely defining
each to the data, meaning, and content in each section. We did not use Braan and Clarke, but as
described in the previous response to reviewers our process was similar. Ryan and Bernard 2003
describe the specific process we used to conduct our thematic content analysis within the
epistemological frame of ethnography and we cited their work in the original manuscript submission.

2). The place of ethnography in this study and how it is represented and has been used in the analysis
needs further attention. The methods section needs radical amendment..... if the authors are only
focusing on semi-structured interviews and not observations and using the full set of methods from an
ethnography then locating the singular reliance on semi-structured intervievs within an approach which
relies principally on observational data and documentary analysis which focus on context and what
people actually do then I renders it inaccurate to call this an ethnographic study/examination.
The additional information about ethnography included in the revision is very general 'text book' like
description rather than specific - to the study. E.g. 'Epistemologically, the goal of ethnography is to
garner a holistic, comprehensive understanding of a particular group of people or a setting from an
insider’s perspective. Methodologically, ethnography is conducting systematic, mixed methods
research to reach that epistemological goal. Specifically, it entails going to the site or sites of study and
conducting any number of methods....'

The additional section describing ethnography was included in response to the previous reviewer’s
questions about the lack of a theoretical approach. Ethnographic or an “ethnographic approach” was the
theoretical approach, although this manuscript does not provide a full ethnographic analysis and only
focuses on the semi-structured interviews (due to a need to focus on the in vivo language used by
participants to describe hand hygiene champions as an implementation strategy). We have made edits to
the section in hopes this tones down the ‘textbook’ description. However, to label our work something
other than “ethnographic” is ‘inaccurate’ because that is the theoretical approach we used going into the
study. We are also willing to remove all mentions of theoretical approaches (any mention of
ethnography or ethnographic), if that is a more satisfactory option. Finally, saying a study cannot have
an ethnographic epistemology if it does not include observations and documentary analysis is a very
narrow view and will preclude ethnographic work from being published in Implementation Science and
other health-related/clinical journals due to space limitations (we do not have space to include an
analysis of observations and document analysis in this manuscript and it did not add to the analysis of
in vivo language defining hand hygiene champions – a subtheme of our larger ethnographic study).