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Cover letter for 2nd revised draft
Reviewer 1/Referee 1: Saifur Rahman

Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Query 1: Information on using the statistical package in the abstract is not necessary. Instead, the authors should only concentrate on briefing the data set (which is not currently included) and its analyses in the abstract section.

Query addressed and highlighted in abstract section. SPSS description is also removed.

Query 2: Here is a major concern that needs to be addressed. It is confusing whether the study based on primary data or it was based on a secondary data analyses. In fact, it is clearly stated that the data has been extracted from IBBS round three. However, the description on sampling and data collection seems that it was primary data and it sounds that this data set was primarily meant for this study.

Please clear it in the method section.

Query addressed, kindly refer to (sky blue) highlighted lines in manuscript section on Sample size.

Minor Essential Revisions

Query 3: Heading and subheadings of table 4 need to be revised and also revise the numbering of the tables.

Query addressed (highlighted heading and subheadings of Table IV)

Discretionary Revisions
Query 4:
Table 4 is too long. I still don’t find any justification of keeping the whole table. However, if it is essential from the authors’ point, the table should be split and the knowledge should be included in a separate table.
The authors are of the view that whole of the table is a continuation of same idea and it’s already classified into subheadings related to known factors associated with HIV prevalence in literature. Insignificant variables are already removed to shorten the table while significant variables are shown to validate the conclusion.

Query 5:
The article also needs some language corrections.
Addressed.

Reviewer 2/Referee 2: John Scott
Reviewer’s report:

Query 6: While I would have still appreciated some more context on services in the region, especially given the conclusions, I am conscious of word limitations and feel that efforts to address my concerns have been adequate.
The query is already answered in the beginning of the fourth paragraph of the discussion section. Few lines are also added in the conclusion section (both parts highlighted with sky blue).

Query 7:
This noted the newly introduced paragraphs need to be edited to tighten up some of the wording/phrasing.
Addressed along with query 4.

Editorial Changes advised:
1. Copyediting: Done