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RE: Response to reviewer comments for MS: 3291352452047984 - HIV Testing and Care in Canadian Aboriginal Youth: A community based mixed methods study.

Dear Ms Manning,

Thank you for your email of July 31st with the reviewers’ comments in relation to the above manuscript. Please see below the revisions we have made to the manuscript based on the reviewers’ feedback. We hope that we have fully addressed the reviewers’ concerns and have uploaded a revised manuscript with the recommended changes.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any additional questions about the manuscript.

Sincerely,

Dr. Judy Mill
Associate Professor
Associate Dean, Global Health
Faculty of Nursing
University of Alberta
Reviewer #1

1. Refer to “qualitative interviews” rather than “interviews” in the methods section of the abstract.
   
   • The phrase “qualitative interviews” has been used in the methods section of the abstract.

2. Provide the eligible age in the methods and median age of respondents in the results of the abstract.
   
   • The eligible age (methods section) and median age (results section) of participants has been added to the results in the abstract.

Reviewer #2

1. There are no compulsory revisions.

2. There are no minor essential revisions.

3. Discretionary revisions: while the study is well referenced, the researchers may want to take into account of international research in Southern African context, for example where young people are particularly vulnerable. Also wondered if there might be a stronger gender analysis.
   
   • References (#11, 13, & 38), with a sub-Saharan African perspective have been added to the background and discussion sections of our manuscript.

   • A stronger gender analysis has not been done for this paper. It is a good suggestion and may be the focus of a future paper.