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**Title:** Infant feeding practices among HIV exposed infants using summary index in Sidama Zone, Southern Ethiopia: A cross sectional study

**Reviewer:** Rose Zulliger

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

**Comment #1:** There are, however, still some missing words and awkwardly phrased sentences throughout the manuscript. I suggest that they seek editing assistance to make the manuscript more easily readable.

**Response #1:** We appreciate the comment that is given to improve the manuscript. We revised again the manuscript and we made essential revisions.

**Comment #2:** Your table and figure numbers still do not match up. Please also ensure that you describe the new table 3 within your text.

**Response #2:** We would like to express our great excuse for the mistake we made again on the figure number. Now we corrected it in the text as well on the legends. We also describe the new table 3 in the text.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

**Comment #3:** Thank you for providing further information on the data collection process. It is very helpful. I am, however, confused by the sentence, "Infants who were discharged from HIV exposed category as HIV negative or HIV positive were excluded from the study." I believe that the authors meant, "Infants were excluded from the study if they were not exposed to HIV or if they were diagnosed as HIV-positive prior to data collection". Please revise accordingly.

**Response #3:** We modify the sentence according to your recommendation to make it more clear for readers. We highlighted it by green in the text.

**Comment #4:** Results- In the first sentence, please clarify "aged 6-17 MONTHS"

**Response #4:** Modified as accordingly **aged 6-17 months**
Reviewer: Huan Zeng

Comment #1: Though they gave some introduction and answer to each of my comment, I think it is better to add relevant information in the main text of the paper. For example, they gave a good answer to comment 4, but I could not see that this information is included in the revised manuscript. So do other comments

Response #1: The comment was about the total number of those mother infants pairs. We did not include the total number in the main text. We showed that we included about 10 of the health institutions from the eligible 14 health institutions. We did not study all the mother infants pairs rather we study 184 study subjects who were available in the selected health institutions. So we believe that it is not necessary to report the total number of eligible subjects and about the proportion of 184 study subjects from the total eligible subjects. That is why we did not include in the revised manuscript.

Comment#2: For some comment, there is no substantial revision. For example, my comment 11: What are the limitations of the study? In the manuscript, there is only one sentence wrote "Interpersonal measurement error, recall bias, and absence of validated questionnaire to assess hygiene and psychosocial care were the possible limitations of this study. " I think it not enough.

Response #2: comment accepted. We also describe the limitation associated with the study design and the scoring system. We highlighted in the main text of the manuscript.

Reviewer: Xiaoyang Sheng

The reviewer has no more comments and satisfied by the responses