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Editor
BMC Public Health

Dear Editor,

On behalf of my co-authors, I submit revisions relating to manuscript entitled: “Sociocultural factors influencing PMTCT in Nigeria.” We are thankful to the editor for acceptance of this manuscript and to the reviewers for their thoughtful comments on ways to revise and strengthen the paper. We have revised this paper based on the comments and concerns raised by the reviewers (see below for point by point response to concerns). We are happy to provide any additional information you may request. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours

Juliet Iwelunmor.

Co-authors: Echezona E. Ezeanolue; Collins O. Airhihenbuwa; Michael C. Obiefune; Chinenye O. Ezeanolue; & Gbenga G. Ogedegbe

Reviewer 1
This study contributes to our understanding of the key socio-cultural factors that inhibit the uptake of PMTCT services thereby reducing pediatric HIV and AIDS. However, the authors may need to consider whether it may not be prudent to:
1. Revist the title of the article with a view to deleting the ‘qualitative review’ since they only reviewed 3 qualitative papers against 37 quantitative articles
2. Defend their choice of only 4 electronic data bases as their sources of data.
3. Disclose in the Table attached which specific journals were reviewed.
4. Why did they have to use only two reviewers?
I would also recommend that the authors substitute the usage of the term ‘X and colleagues” with the term ‘et al’. It may also be useful to replace the use of ‘et al’ in the list of references with the actual names of the other authors.

We are thankful for the reviewer’s comments and we have made corrections as suggested. Specifically, we revisited the title of the articles and deleted the words ‘qualitative review” and replaced it with the title “a synthesis of the literature.” Furthermore, we choose the 4 electronic databases as the sources for our synthesis as we were looking for only peer-reviewed academic literature that addressed the objectives of our paper. This is also a potential limitation with our paper and we have revised the limitation section to reflect this. We also include the references where we
adapted our review from now and we feel (based on these references), that it is not necessary to write the specific journals that were reviewed. Instead, more information is provided in the reference section and we have made efforts to ensure that our list of references have the actual names of the authors. Finally, a total of three reviewers screened the papers. We all came to the same conclusions with the papers and so we felt that it was not necessary to include other reviewers. The reviewers also used a standard checklist for appraising the studies included. Specifically, we assessed whether the objectives of the paper where sufficiently described, whether study design was evident and appropriate, whether information on target population was provided, whether data collection methods and analysis were clearly described, whether results were reported in a sufficient manner and whether the conclusion were supported by the results. All co-authors reviewed the flow of results, and more specifically, the author of the PEN-3 cultural model, reviewed the results and helped us clarify whether they correspond with the domains of the model. Finally, we have replaced the use of ‘and colleagues’ to ‘et al.’

Reviewer 2

*Overall, the manuscript is well written. However the limitations of the PEN3 model are not discussed. Specifically we made reference to a recently published paper that synthesize limitations associated with using the PEN-3.*

We have revised our limitations section as suggested by the reviewer and now we address the limitations of the PEN-3 cultural model. Specially we made reference to a recently published paper that synthesize limitations associated with using the PEN-3 such as with transferability. that is the extent to which the findings from our synthesis of the literature using the model can be transferred from one context to another.