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- 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” The suggestion was taken care of

**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” The suggestion was made.

**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 The suggestions were effected 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...” This section was modified appropriately 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” The suggestions were incorporated in the revision. 6. Page 16, 2nd paragraph, lines 1-2, 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” This suggestion was taken care of. 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. Some illustrative quotes from FGD participants have been included as suggested.
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