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Dear Mr Jimmar Dizon

RE: Manuscript 6011371225917587 - Patterns of Condom use and associated factors among adult HIV positive clients in North Western Ethiopia: A comparative cross sectional study.

We wanted to thank you and the reviewer for your time in reviewing our manuscript and the thoughtful suggestions. Enclosed, please find a point-by-point reply to the reviewer comments.
We feel our revised manuscript is improved because of the reviewer’s suggestions and hope you find these changes acceptable.

Thank you.
Response to comments by the Associate Editor

REV. STATEMENT 1:

"do not refer to the IAS conference itself, I have provided many references."

EDITORIAL STATEMENT: I agree with the rev. If you have access to published peer reviewed papers. Please replace references to conferences with references to published articles were appropriate, whenever possible. The general principle in scientific journals is NOT to use conference citations unless no relevant published data is available.

AUTHORS REFLECTIONS: Thank you for the comment! In the revised manuscript we tried to cite references which are recent and from peer reviewed journals. The reference from conferences is replaced with a journal article.

REV. STATEMENT 2: "....one very alarming result of their study is the proportion of sexually active respondents. Only 48.9% of people reported to be sexually active.

It is really few and we can see that the proportion is not higher in people with ART (than in ART naïve group) which could indicate that the quality of ART education that should include discussion on sexuality with ART is questionable."

AUTHORS REFLECTIONS: Comment accepted and we modified the sentence. Being face to face administered questionnaire their might be under reporting of sexual activity by the study participants. Hence, social desirability bias as a probable cause for the low reported sexual activity is mentioned as limitation of the study.

REV. STATEMENT 3: "....? many HIV infected persons are now living longer, healthier and more sexually active lives?. In this context, their data on sexuality on HIV infected persons is surprising. Explanations may be linked to the health status of participants (?) but maybe also in a strong level of auto-stigmatization and fear to infect somebody else. In the article this perspective is never discussed."

AUTHORS REFLECTIONS: Comment accepted and ‘sexual active lives ‘is removed from the sentence as it is still debatable and may vary from context to context.
REV. STATEMENT 4: In the discussion section, further elaboration is needed. As an example, the authors can use systematically the following sentence to explain their results:

> this difference may be due to study design, study setting, sampling technique.

**AUTHORS REFLECTIONS:** Thank you for the comment. The discussion section is extensively reviewed and we have removed the sentence.

REV. STATEMENT 5:

> most of the respondents reported partner refusal and desire of having children as the main reason for inconsistent condom use. Following this, the authors conclude:.....so efforts should be strengthen to change client’s attitude towards condom use through continuous health education on their follow up period?. This statement doesn’t seem very appropriate according the reasons described before.

**AUTHORS REFLECTIONS:** Thank you for the comment. This is actually not a major finding and not relevant for this manuscript. Hence, we have removed this from the discussion section.
Response to comments by Emilie HENRY

Dear Emilie HENRY

Thank you very much for your comments. Apologies for not reflecting some of the responses we gave in the main document. Below we have addressed point by-point all the raised concerns.

1. in the background section (abstracts and article), you stated "an increasing number of sexual transmission may stem from those who know they are infected and engage in unprotected sex"…..

   **Response to reviewer:** We have removed the sentence and included most recent information.

2. In the discussion section, I think you could go further on the interpretation and discussion of your data and model. You can't just take your results one by one and discuss it explaining that "the difference may be due to study setup, study design, sampling technique"….

   **Response to reviewer:** Thank you for the suggestion! Comment accepted and the whole discussion is revised as per your suggestion.

We believe the changes have led to further improvement of the manuscript and hope it is acceptable in its revised form.

Yours sincerely!

Estifanos Yalew

Desalegn Tegabu Zegeye

Solomon Meseret