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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions
- Minor Essential Revisions

Introduction:
1. Page 6, (i) lines 9-10, to read “… HIV/AIDS-related activity falls under ‘Reproductive…” Delete “and”

Methodology:
Data Collection
2. Page 8, (i) line 6, indicates that Table 1 was provided but that table was not provided.
(ii)2nd paragraph lines 14 -15, to read, “…These interviews were recorded through rapid note taking. Delete “to”

Results:
3. Page 10, (i) lines 3-4, to read ” …While the council…responsible for preparation of the CCHP…” delete “to prepare” the CCHP (ii) lines 6-7 to read “The planning and priority setting processes related to the PMTCT programmes were …” delete was
4. Page 12,(i) lines 10-11, to read “The district informants complained that whatever activity they proposed to…” (ii), to read “The district informants thus reported that they experienced loss of influence and autonomy…”
5. Page 13,(i) lines 9-12, to read “…In a similar vein, informants… reported that restrictions … priority areas (including the budget ceilings) limited their capability for independent priority setting and consequent allocation of funds and in practice blocked all PMTCT activities prioritized by the district.” Delete “made their room”, and “very limited”
6. Page 16, 2nd paragraph, lines1-2, to read “Another informant from a health facility similarly amplified the lack of inclusion of their priorities, and emphasized their feeling of frustration due to that development”. Delete “explained”
7. Although data were generated through the use of FGDs and IDIs, the result was based mainly on information from IDIs as depicted in the quotes provided.
Indeed, only one illustrative quote was from an FGD participant. Information from the FGDs should be integrated in the manuscript.

8. Moreover there was no comparison of the findings from the FGDs and IDIs in terms of similarities or divergences. This should be done.

Discussion:

9. Page 19, 2nd paragraph, lines 4-5, to read, “…The regional administrative levels in Tanzania are however still far removed from most people”.

10. Page 20, paragraph 1, line 10, to read “…perception that the PMTCT programme is donor driven”. Delete “funded”.

11. Page 21, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-4, to read “The findings…add to existing evidence of top-down…” Delete “or”

12. Page 22, 2nd paragraph, lines 2-3, there appears to be a contradiction in the statement in these lines. This needs to be clarified, “All the same, we do wish to suggest that the findings of the present study together with other similar findings seem to work to reinforce the established power structures rather than integrate priorities of lower levels stakeholders, which is the aim of the decentralization process”.

13. Page 23, 2nd paragraph, line 10, to read, “…attention should be paid to the methods to be used in bringing up local priorities. Delete “use”
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