Author's response to reviews

Title: Key informant perspectives on policy- and service-level challenges and opportunities for delivering integrated sexual and reproductive health and HIV care in South Africa

Authors:

Jennifer A Smit (jsmit@match.org.za)
Kathryn Church (kathryn.church@lshtm.ac.uk)
Cecilia Milford (cmilford@match.org.za)
Abigail D Harrison (Abigail_harrison@brown.edu)
M E Beksinska (mbeksinska@match.org)

Version: 3 Date: 28 January 2012

Author's response to reviews: see over
Saturday, January 28, 2012

Dear Dr Shaw

Re: MS: 1205410745464511 Key informant perspectives on the policy- and service-level challenges and opportunities for delivering integrated sexual and reproductive health and HIV care in South Africa, by: Jennifer A Smit, Kathryn Church, Cecilia Milford, Abigail D Harrison and Mags E Beksinska, BMC Health Services Research

Thank you for your email of the 17th January. We have made the final changes you require for acceptance of the paper. We have done the following:-

1. We have moved the study limitations to the start of the discussion.
2. We have checked the word count which is now 4494 including the figures and references.
3. We have checked the article for the correct structure.
4. Updated the 'abbreviations' section
5. Removed column lines from table.
6. Added the Figure title after the references and below Table 1

We hope we have covered all your points adequately. Thank you for considering our article for your Journal

Best Regards

Prof Jenni Smit
Deputy Divisional Head
Dear Dr. Beksinska:

Good day!

Please find at the bottom of this e-mail the response Dr. Sara Shaw to your e-mail dated 8 July 2011 with regards to your query whether the revisions you will be doing to the manuscript is acceptable.

Should you have any concerns, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Best wishes,

Mae

Flory Mae Calumpita
Journal Editorial Office
Biomed Central
on behalf of Dr. Sara Shaw

Dear Jenni

Many thanks for your recent letter. I welcomed your outline of proposed changes and am keen for your paper to be resubmitted.

I am obviously unable to guarantee that your paper will be accepted. However, what you outline in your letter all sounds sensible. Each of your points fit with the requirements of the journal and my previous comments regarding the paper. The additional information regarding the quantitative aspect of the work is useful background. In addition to the points you outline, it would be helpful to readers if you refer to the quantitative aspect of the study (to ensure they are aware that the work you present is part of a wider study and also enabling them to follow it up). It would also be helpful to make it clear that it is not possible to examine international factors and why.

I hope this is helpful and look forward to receiving a revised copy of your paper.....

Kind regards

Sara Shaw
Dear Sara
Re: MS: 1205410745464511 Key informant perspectives on the policy- and service-level challenges and opportunities for delivering integrated sexual and reproductive health and HIV care in South Africa, by: Jennifer A Smit, Kathryn Church, Cecilia Milford, Abigail D Harrison and Mags E Beksinska, BMC Health Services Research

Thank you for your email of the 25th June and your comments along with the reviewers’ responses to our revisions. We also thank you for giving us an opportunity to revise our paper following this process and we would like to confirm that we would like to resubmit a further revision.

We note that all three reviewers were happy with our suggested revisions. Therese Delvaux who suggested a compulsory revision of addition of findings on clients stated that this “was addressed and the authors felt that this paper is worth being published as a piece” leaving the final decision with the editor.

We have read the editor’s comments and propose addressing them in the following ways:

• We will edit the paper to 5000 words in length.
• Regarding the quantitative component, we would prefer to avoid adding in quantitative data, and would follow your suggestion to include the follow-up from the qualitative work and a description of the development of the intervention “the development of an integrated service delivery model”. Adding in the quantitative data would further exceed the word count (both from methodology and data text), which would then imply substantial cutting down of the existing information from the key informants. Since this is qualitative data, we are reluctant to cut this further as it would remove some of the interesting complexity in the data. The client exit survey data do not speak to the service and policy context of integration, but cover more basic measures of services used and accessed during a visit. There is a small amount of data on preferences for integration, but this is rather crude and quantitative data on client preferences for integration is subject to substantial reporting bias.
• We will conduct further analysis to tease out the national and provincial perspectives/factors, as requested. While some international respondents were interviewed, they were not questioned about international factors, but were interviewed more for their knowledge on South Africa; therefore we will not examine international factors since we have no data on that.
• We will assign respondent categories to the data extracts, as requested
• We will also address the minor editorial points you raised at the end of your email.

Please advise us on the above suggestions and if they are acceptable to your Journal.

Jenni Smit