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Reviewer's report:

The authors have revised the paper and improved it. However, I do have a few comments or concerns

Major compulsory revisions

Introduction:

1. Paragraph 3: Could the authors consider use of the more current references in place of reference 16 for example “the demographic health survey, June 2010” as opposed to the 2003 that they quote. The authors might also consider revising the statistics in view of the new reference “in excess of 30%”

Methods:

1. It would be very beneficial if the authors could include a paragraph or more in this section, expounding further on the health policy triangle model for readers who are not familiar with the model. The four components of the model could be explained further also elaborating how this model has been used in previous studies and the similarity or differences in this particular study analysis. Further, could the authors include more references on the application of this model in previous studies? The authors state “The model has been used widely” yet indicate only one reference.

2. Ethical clearance: in Para 5 of this section, the authors indicate that “at the time of the study ethical approval was not considered necessary for Kenya” this statement can be misunderstood or misleading for future studies. Ethical approval is always necessary in Kenya no matter the nature of the study (operational or clinical trials e.t.c). Can the authors indicate the KEMRI approval numbers?

Results:

1. Whereas this section has been improved the authors continue to reference in this section which is very confusing to the reader. Referencing should not be done in this section.

Discussion:

1. This section has been improved and in addition discusses the results of the study in the context of the new PITC models.
Minor essential revisions
The authors should take a round with the manuscript on typos

Introduction
1. Paragraph 2: Second sentence, can the authors please indicate when there were 3 doctors and 49 nurses per 100000. I see a reference but for the reader the timing is important.
2. Same paragraph, reference 13 could be placed at the end of the last sentence.
3. Paragraph 3 last sentence, delete repeated words “in the”

Methods
1. Paragraph 1: first sentence the words “perceptions attitudes” include “and” between the two words.
2. Para 2: sentence 1, delete the brackets and let the sentence flow. Write Sept in full.

Discussion
1. Paragraph 4, sentence 5 starting with “indeed there no” change to “indeed there is no”
2. Para 4 sentence 6 “HTC” should be defined.
3. Same sentence, “HTC is has” replace with “ HTC it has”

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.