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This response was prepared for the reviewer 1: John Scott

I would like to express my gratitude for your valuable comment on our manuscript. As per your comment we revise the manuscript then the final document was edited by professional editor for language improvement. We hope the revised manuscript is much better than the previous one.

Thanks again!
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Major compulsory Revision

Abstract
- In general we revise the abstract using BMC Style
- Grammatical errors are corrected - All spelling errors and capitalization are corrected accordingly

Methods
- Total number of participants are mentioned (page 5)
- Grammatical errors are corrected accordingly

Result
- The figure and tables are also revised according to the comments given and also cited within the body according to their set of order.
- Some statement which doesn’t give sense also revised after reading the original document. The incomplete sentences are completed accordingly. (Particularly the sentence given under category “tested by coincident” on page 11). Based on this comment we also try to see other narratives accordingly.

Discussion:
- Thanks for your good constructive comments in this section. The repetitions mentioned in your comments had been corrected.
- For the reviewers concern with regard to ageing and gender which was mentioned in the discussion without giving enough data on the results section is revised and we included data in the results section, page 17 and 18.

- Single sentence paragraphs are removed/corrected throughout the MS.

Conclusions
The limitations of the research also addressed as per your comment.

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract
- Revised based on the BMC style.

Background
- We believe we did extensive relevant literature reviews as far as our reach to literature is concerned. However we could still work further if it is needed & we can get some more materials.
- The Justification the research is included as per the comments on the last paragraph of the background (page 4)
- As per your comment, we try to revise the connectivity between the paragraphs under background and discussion. In addition after we revise it one additional person who is a profession on this regard also edited the language issues.

Methods
- The importance of selecting key informant was explained as requested (under study participants page 6, first paragraph)
- The rationale for minimum age was set due to ethical issues. This is also indicated within the second paragraph (page 5).
- For the concern regarding process/techniques followed to communicate with participants. It is indicated in page 6 second paragraph.
- For the concern of ethical consideration, we have mentioned it under the sub-topic ethical issues. But, if you suggest we should elaborate it further we can do that. It is found on page 8.
- Justification for collected data from health care providers is discussed under study participant’s selection page 6 on the last sentence of the first paragraph.
- For the question; what are those professionals it is indicated in detail in Table 2 at the end of the manuscript.
**Result**

- For the first concern using quotes, thanks for this, we have added some more quotes from the discordant couples. Moreover, there is one woman who is HIV positive that lives in a discordant relationship as the same time work as a peer educator at health center. She could be considered as both. However, our presentation may seem like we give emphasis on the narratives of key informants. What we observe during the analysis the narratives of our key informants were more comprehensive than the target population (discordant couples). For instance, our key informants address most of the concepts in one paragraph than discordant couples whereas the discordant couple’s statements were so long and detail. As a result we try to judge which quotes could be more comprehensive to support each properties/sub-categories. We hope by now, it looks fair presentation of quotes.

- For the concern on constant comparison, we applied constant comparison during the analysis; this helped us to develop our memos on different emerged concepts/categories. We try to see some phenomena at different level of experience from informants’ angle. The comparison helped us to link between categories with their sub-categories. Moreover, the ongoing sampling procedure was based on our constant comparison of the analysis. Therefore, this process helped us for a continuous refinement throughout the data collection and analysis process, continuously feeding back into the process of category coding.

- Regarding result 4: “Our Cosmo: couples’ living circumstance”, we gave our explanation compulsory revision under discussion part. We hope we address the issues raised here. As per the comment given we add some supporting data from informant’s interviewee.

- “Action/interaction/strategy” seems mentioned repeatedly. We have tried to reduce the repletion of this word throughout the MS. However, we used this word to show each concept especially to show how couples’ decision towards certain action/interaction/strategies were linked with those conditions or context. Thus, this word/s was not mentioned to indicate something about the analysis/grounded theory. In fact this word comes from the paradigm model used in the analysis, but while we try to discuss each categories and sub-categories we were not trying to tell again and again about the analysis (frame of analysis) rather we were try to show how couple’s actions/interaction/strategies were affected within certain conditions and context. For your concern, we revise and remove some of these words from different parts.

- Societies & cultural context were somehow mentioned in this study too. It is also included in the figure, but maybe it is not depth. As we describe in the limitation, time was one of the challenges since this research was done under an academic program for the requirement of master’s degree. There is also some other concept that was emerged in the analysis, but we couldn’t go further due to the limitation – concept like “seroconversion”. Thus, we try to incorporate these issues in our theoretical model so that other researchers could strengthen the finding.