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**REVISON OF JOURNAL ARTICLE**

MS: 1149196422101561 - Health service barriers to HIV testing and counseling among pregnant women attending ANC; a cross-sectional study

Thank you for assessing and proposing revisions to enhance better understanding of our manuscript.

We have revised the above manuscript according to your comments. Please find below the comments and the subsequent revisions made.

**REFEREE 1**

The minor corrections indicated by referee one have bee attend to. This included;

- Page 6 - Sub metro should be sub-metro – **done**

- Page 6 - The statement *‘Simple random sampling ballot in which health facilities offering PMTCT...’* under study population and sample should be revised - **done**

- Authors should state how many respondents were recruited from each of the facilities to further throw light on the recruitment of respondents - **done**

- Page 6 – *‘...YES’ and ‘NO”, were put in a box for pick b respondents’. The ‘by’ was without y. - **Done**

- Page 7 (under ethical consideration) - ‘Confidentiality anonymity was adhered to’. This statement should be revised – **statement deleted**

**Results**
Major compulsory revisions

- In the sample size calculation, the authors need to indicate what WIFA refer to
  - This was the WIFA in the Kumasi metropolis. It has been elaborated

- Time frame of the study need to be stated – done

- Basis for doing 5 FGDs need to be stated. In addition it would be helpful to state how participants in these were assembled
  - This had already been stated in the study

- It would be helpful to state topics that were discussed in both in-depth interviews and FGDs.
  - Done

- How many participants were involved in in-depth interviews, this need to be mentioned
  - Done

- The methodology of the quantitative part is inadequate

- Need to state factors that were included in models that adjusted for confounding and justification for including such covariates. They need to test for interactions (effect modification) between covariates
  - The quantitative analysis was a logistic regression analysis to complement responses from the qualitative study. The variables (all binary with yes and no responses) included were limited to those in relation to respondents’ experiences at the health facility. However, the study estimated both crude OR and adjusted
OR to throw light on possible confounding and interactions.

- Table 1. Religion not adding up to 100% - corrected
- Table 2. Could be improved to clearly show the reference categories and factors included in the multivariable models
  - Table 2 has been improved as recommended

Minor essential revisions

- In the introduction PMTCT and MTCT used interchangeably, need to be consistent
  - This has been looked at. However income cases they are used separately to mean different things

- First 3 lines in the results section unnecessary - revised

Author’s revisions

The title of the study has been changed to ‘Health service barriers to HIV testing and counseling among pregnant women attending ANC; a cross-sectional study’.

We hope our revisions will be accepted and our article published.

Thank you.