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Title: Gender Variations in Access, Choice to use and Cleaning of Shared Latrines; Experiences from Kampala Slums, Uganda

Reviewer: Leanne E Unicomb

Minor Essential Revisions

Methods;

Comment
In the last paragraph of page 7, there is a description of community transects. The information on those who were key informants seems misplaced at the end of this paragraph, unless there is a linking sentence that makes this an appropriate inclusion here.

Response to comment and Action taken

The comment was of merit, and as such the information about Key informants has been taken to where Key informants are being described in the first paragraph on page 7. As a result the flow of the paper is now harmonised.

Comment
There is some text missing in the third sentence of page 8 as it is not clear what is meant.

Response to comment and Action taken

Indeed, there was a missing text as mentioned by the reviewer. We have since linked the two sentences for clarity and continuity. This correction is on the same page.

Comment
I had previously suggested ‘It is not clear how the literature review was part of the methods, presumably to inform development of interview guideline themes. I would omit this.” Reviewing the literature is a normal research process when developing studies and their instruments. I think some text to elaborate how the literature review was more than the usual requirements would be useful.

Response to comment and Action taken

The inclusion of literature review in the methods has been omitted as advised.

Results:

Comment
As noted in the previous review, the early sentences at the beginning of this section better suit the discussion than the results. Perhaps this needs an editorial decision

Response to comment and Action taken
The first four sentences have been shifted to the discussion section where they indeed belong. See page 21, last paragraph.

**Comment**
On page 15, I would not refer to a potty as a household utensil. Perhaps a household device?

**Response to comment and Action taken**
This change has been effected. See page 15

**Comment**
I had originally suggested that Figure II be omitted as it was not referred in the text. I think that this is an interesting proposal and a great contribution for the shared sanitation research area. On a minor point, when referring to the continuum include ‘(Figure II)” to enhance recognition of the model.

**Response to comment and Action taken**
Indeed, the continuum in figure II has been emphasised for enhanced recognition as advised. Please see pages 17 and 23.

**Comment**
The conclusion section needs some English streamlining.

**Response to comment and Action taken**
This comment has been addressed and as a result, the conclusion makes better reading. Not only has the conclusion been edited for better English and streamlining, but the whole manuscript has been checked for any errors and other inconsistencies.