To,

The Editor-in chief

Microbes, Infection and Chemotherapy

Subject: Submission of the revised manuscript

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for your consideration, reviewing and valuable comments of the referee(s) for the manuscript entitled "A Cross-sectional study to assess the knowledge, attitude and practice among healthcare workers regarding COVID-19 at a National Institute of North India" which we submitted to your esteemed journal 'Microbes, Infection and Chemotherapy'.

We greatly appreciate the constructive comments. We have now addressed these comments, and this has strengthened the paper. We would request you to please review the document being as we have modified the text as required with the track changes review mode in corrected manuscript file to facilitate the work for the reviewers as below-

Author Contribution Statement incorporated in the corrected manuscript file as- The authors confirm their contribution to the paper as follows: study conception and design: MK, SKM; data collection: MK; analysis and interpretation of results- MSD, MK, SKM; draft manuscript preparation: MSD, SG. All authors reviewed the results and approved the final version of the manuscript. All authors agreed to be responsible for all aspects of the work to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the published manuscript.

Author replies to comments of the reviewers are as follows:-

Reviewer A:

----

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Reviewers Comment: Good

Remarks: None

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Reviewers Comment: Regular

Remarks: None

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Reviewers Comment: Regular

Remarks: None

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.

Reviewers Comment: Good

Remarks: None

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

Reviewers Comment: Yes

Remarks: None

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.

Reviewers Comment: Regular

Remarks: None

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Reviewers Comment: Regular

Remarks: None

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Reviewers Comment: Regular

Remarks: None

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.

Reviewers Comment: Good

Remarks: None

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?

Reviewers Comment: Needs some language corrections

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. We tried our best and done all the changes as suggested by the reviewers in the corrected manuscript file.

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

Reviewers Comment: Increase the studied sample number

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. This descriptive cross-sectional study was a time bound and single centre study included HCWs of the national institute of North India. The sample size was calculated by the exact binomial confidence limit method as explained in methodology section in corrected manuscript file. By this method, the sample size was 170.66. Therefore, we enrolled 171 participants in our study.

Reviewer D:
----

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Reviewers Comment: Good

Remarks: None

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Reviewers Comment: Good

Remarks: Professionally written.

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Reviewers Comment: Regular

Remarks: The paper's introduction is very clear, but it lacks of information in terms of rationale and relevance to make a better closure.

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. Changes are done as suggested by the reviewer and incorporated in the corrected manuscript file.

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.

Reviewers Comment: Good

Remarks: Sample size: "Prevalence of good KAP is 0.8" How did authors decide the frequency?

Statistics: for cont. numeric variables, how was the distribution analysis conducted? (Histogram at least?). To calculate p values in tables 3 and 4 it is necessary to explain this. Regression methods are not described.

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

Reply to remarks for Sample Size-

- A statement "Bloom's cut-off of 80% was used to determine sufficient knowledge, positive attitude and good practice" is incorporated in corrected manuscript file.

Reply to remarks for Statistics:

- For cont. Numeric variables, normal distribution analysis was assessed by using the skewness and kurtosis test.
- In tables 3 and 4, p values are calculated by using student t-test between two groups and ANOVA test for more than two groups.
- Regression methods described and incorporated in the revised manuscript as- Multivariate linear regression analysis used to measure the degree of association of independent and dependent variables. All analyses were two-sided and P value <0.05 was regarded as statistically significant.

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

Reviewers Comment: Yes

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.

Reviewers Comment: Good

Remarks: Table 5: The values next to coefficients are 95%CI? or standard errors?

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. In Table 5: The values next to coefficients are 95% CI of unstandardized coefficient.

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Reviewers Comment: Regular

Remarks: Sampling methods have more implications to be discussed, such as bias. This matter needs to be discussed.

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

Reply to remarks: Stratified random sampling was applied among different cadre of HCWs to have equitable distribution as maximum as possible to reduce selection bias. Researchers not hold prior knowledge of the population's shared characteristics beforehand.

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Reviewers Comment: Good

Remarks: None

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.

Reviewers Comment: Good

Remarks: None

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?

Reviewers Comment: Acceptable

Remarks: None

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it.

Reviewers Comment: No comments

Remarks: None

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

We hope our revised version will be received favorably and look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Thanking you

With regards

Dr. Manoj Kumar (Corresponding Author)