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Editorial Manager,
BMC Public Health

Dear Editor,

We have pleasure in addressing the reviewers’ comments of the following manuscript:

The perceptions on male circumcision as a preventive measure against HIV infection and considerations in scaling up of the services: a qualitative study among police officers in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

REVIEWER 1: JULIA SAMUELSON

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

Methods

1. **Setting**: The method of selection for the three stations is described in page 6 under subheading **Setting**: lines 2-3 AND in page 7 under subheading **Sampling**: lines 1-4

2. **Sampling**: The method used to recruit study informants is described in page 7 under subheading sampling, line 4, AND page 8, paragraph 1, lines 1-7.

3. The training of the nurse interviewers is briefly described in page 8, under Data collection section, paragraph 2, lines 2-4 AND page 9, paragraph 1, lines 1-2.
Results
1. a) Informant characteristics: Further information has been added: a) mean age, and range of men and of women 10 under Results section: paragraph 1, lines 1-3.
b) The proportion of informants who had 4 years of secondary education has been added in page 10 under Results section: line 3
c) The statement ‘of these’ has been amended. See page 10 under Results section: lines 3-4
   d) The proportion of informants who are residents of Dar es Salaam is indicated in page 10, under Results section: lines 7-8.

Discussion
1. The discussion section has been strengthened. The paragraphs have been structured around the levels of influence in the Social Ecological Model (SEM). See pages 24-27.

2. The implications’ section has been strengthened in line with the levels of SEM. See pages 28-29.

Unclear statements
All unclear statements under the discussion section have been amended.

Limitations
a) We have emphasized on small numbers of participants and from limited geographical area as suggested. See page 28, under limitation section: line 1.
   b) The 1st sentence in the original manuscript has been amended as suggested. See a) above.

Implications
This section has been strengthened by reflecting on the levels of the SEM as suggested. See page 28-29, the Implications section.
Conclusions

a) Clarity on the statement, ‘Integrating MC into childhood… has been improved.
   See page 29, lines 4-5.

b) Last sentence has been amended. See page 29, lines 7-8.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

A professional English speaker has performed English language editing

Background

1. In the background, it is clearly stated that the evidence from the three RCTs demonstrated about 60% reduction in risk of men acquiring HIV from women. See page 3, paragraph 2, line 7.

2. The sentence on page 4 in the original manuscript has been rewritten to emphasize that MC only provides partial protection of male acquisition of HIV, it should not replace….’ See page 4, paragraph 1, lines 7-9.

3. Sentence 4 in the original draft has been removed because it lacks relevance to the present study

4. The number on ART has been updated. See page 5, paragraph 2, line 13; and a statement on the Tanzania policy/strategy on MC has been added. See page 4, paragraph 2, lines 8-9.

Methods

1. Data analysis: The summary generated from key findings was written. See page 9, paragraph 2, lines 1-2.

2. Table 1: In principal, all codes fall under one category. This was just an example of coding process. Therefore, it is not correct to add categories in the third column in line with the second and third sets of item under the codes column.
3. The sequence of tables 1 & 2 have been exchanged for clarity and the order has been maintained as in the text. See pages 9, paragraph 2, line 10 AND page 10, paragraph 3, line 1 respectively.

4. Table 2: The title has been amended. See page 40.

5. Table 2: Column 1. The word concept has been exchanged with levels, and each level has been labeled to match the description in the text. See pages 10-24 AND page 40.

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS
1. More updated references have been added. See references in page 31-38.
2. The www.malecircumcision.org has been used to get more specific references about MC.
3. Ethical considerations: All informants were adults, and minimum age was 19 years old. See page 10, paragraph 1, line 2 AND Results section, paragraph 1, line 2.
REVIEWER 2: SHELLEY LEES

BACKGROUND:
The sections have been reordered and repetition of information has been removed. See pages 3-6.

The statistics for HIV and MC prevalence and the scaling up of MMC information have been added and reorganized. See page 3, paragraph 2, lines 1-8.

The section on scaling up MC has now addressed that MC is only partially protective. See page 4, paragraph 1, line 8.

The sections on removal of penile foreskin and microbicide have been deleted from the text to increase clarity and relevancy of information in the background.

A more detailed description of the participants has been added at the beginning. See page 5, paragraph 3, line 3 AND page 6, paragraph 1, lines 1-3.

The circumcision status of the men is not known. See page 10 under Results section, lines 9-10.

METHODS:
The selection process to account for any bias has been described. See page 7, lines 1-4 AND page 8, paragraph 1, lines 1-7.

Thirty four in-depth interviews were conducted; 24 men and 10 women respectively. See the abstract page 2, Methods section, line 1 AND under Results section, page 10, line 1.

Data saturation was assessed through the principles of content saturation. See page 8, paragraph 1, lines 7-9.

Detailed analysis has been added. See page 9, paragraph 2.
The tables have been re-ordered in a proper sequence. See pages 9, paragraph 2, line 10 AND page 10, paragraph 3, line 1. Also see pages 39 -40.

**FINDINGS SECTION:**
Has been edited and most of the repetitions have been removed. See pages 10-24. The information in the beliefs’ section has been divided into two: ‘Individuals’ beliefs...’ and ‘Individuals’ perception...’ to clarity. See Results pages 13 section ii) and 14 section iii) AND table 1, page 39.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**
The whole section has been re-written according to the levels of SEM as suggested by reviewer 1. See pages 24-29.

The phrase ‘partial protection’ has been moved into introduction. See page 4, paragraph 1, lines 7-9.

**ADDITIONAL SPECIFIC COMMENTS:**

**METHODS**
A detailed description of the participants has been added. See pages 7, under the Study Population.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**
The two sections have been amended according to SEM as suggested by the reviewer 1 above. See page 24-29.

**TITLE:**
In the title, we have replaced ‘adults’ with ‘police officers’ as suggested. See page 1.
LANGUAGE
A professional English speaker has edited the manuscript.

Sincerely Yours,

Edith A.M. Tarimo, (RN, BSc. Nursing, MPhil, PhD)