Reviewer's report:

While the authors have certainly made important revisions, I do not feel that they have adequately addressed the points raised in my previous review.

There are significant outstanding issues in the methodology, data analysis and conclusions arising from the study.

Given that the authors have had an opportunity to improve the manuscript based on feedback from three reviewers, the revisions made so far do not indicate sufficient progress. Unfortunately, this leads me to think that there are major issues in the study that are unlikely to be resolved by further revisions.

Some examples of methodological issues

• All relevant factors for adherence and non-adherence have not been adequately explored (i.e. caregiver HIV status, duration of ART, regimen type, tablet or syrup formulation, etc).
• The reasons for ‘missing doses’ in Figure 1 is incomplete and the instrument is unlikely to have been validated.
• Language relating to healthcare provider factors in Table 2 is ambiguously worded. Not all relevant factors appear to have been included.
• It is unclear how representative the study sample is to the overall group of children treated in the study area or Ethiopia.

The language style is not up to the level of a peer-reviewed publication and needs to be much improved.

However, the main problem I think is that the manuscript offers little new insights on adherence behaviours in this setting and it is unclear to me whether the findings are relevant for clinical practice or policy.

The only key conclusion of the paper is reconfirmation of high levels of adherence to ART among children (as provided by caregivers’ report), but this in itself is insufficient to warrant publication. With regret, I recommend rejection of the manuscript but would suggest to the authors that more care is taken during the study design and planning stage to minimise avoidable limitations.
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