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22.12.2010
The Editor,
BMC Health Services Research

Re: Responses to Associate Editor’s comments
We have revised the manuscript as per comments from the associate editor. Further the manuscript has undergone editing for grammar and we have acknowledged the grammar editors in the acknowledgements section. The manuscript has also been shortened. It is difficult to point out where the grammar changes are since the whole manuscript was polished. However kindly find below the responses to some of the specific concerns raised.

Associate Editor's comments:
This paper is stronger, but still requires editing, particularly in grammar. The authors must do the following to ensure acceptance:

1. This paper requires formal editing for proper English grammar and sentence structure. This is an ongoing problem throughout the paper. I cannot list all of the grammatical issues present in the paper, which must be addressed prior to acceptance in BMC Health Services Research.
Response: Manuscript has undergone editing for grammar by BioMedEs

2. Please briefly define "explanatory models" in the Abstract so the reader knows what you are referring to.
Response: Explanatory models have been defined in the abstract, sentence 2

3. Several of my comments were not addressed. Specifically:

"These effects are particularly stronger through the indirect effects which are socially patterned with individuals with poor socio-economic position, poor social support and female gender being the most at risk group. Evidence also exists suggesting a heightened risk for contracting HIV infection among those with mental disorders." (p. 5)

The authors mention that structural equation modeling was used in a prior paper, but the reader has no way of knowing this. The authors must review this sentence and the prior one to better frame the results from the prior paper and how they are related to the findings in the current paper.
Response: These sentence have been edited on page 5 paragraph 1, sentence 1 through 3

Also, the Results section should be structured with subheadings, with each research question as the subheading, to better demonstrate how the results reported actually address the research questions of interest. The authors have not done an effective job of linking the stated research questions in the Introduction to the presented Results.
Response: Subheading have been added to the different parts of the results section

Sincerely,

Peter Jay Chipimo