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Author’s response to reviews:

Rebuttal

Reviewer 1: Talitha Crowley

General Comment

Thank you for your valuable inputs. Kindly find the responses to your concerns

1. Type of Qualitative research design:

Thank you for taking note of the omission on the type of study design. This was a descriptive phenomenological study design. This valid point has been addressed.

2. Decision to interview only 15 mothers:

This was part of a bigger study which was looking at Socio-cultural realities of following through with PMTCT in a rural community. A detailed understanding and narratives of mothers who were struggling to adhere was therefore necessary to understand the phenomena. Out of the 108 breastfeeding mothers who were on PMTCT during the study period, 18 were identified as having challenges and 15 volunteered to participate. The further explanation is documented.

3. The misalignment between the inclusion criteria and the study aim:

Thank you for noting that misalignment. The title has been revised to include the word breastfeeding mothers.
4. Training of researchers:

This has been explained and the roles of each researcher highlighted. The researchers are experienced in qualitative data collection and they were also led by a Social scientist and a psychologist who have extensively published qualitative research articles.

5. Use of percentages:

Thank you for this observation. This has been addressed. The numbers were indeed too small to make percentages meaningful.

Point by Point Response to Reviewer 2: Sara Nieuwoudt

1. General Comment:

Thank you for taking your time to go through this document and your valuable input which is highly appreciated and has been considered for the strengthening of this paper. Please find the detailed responses to the issues raised.

2. Number of times the mother was interviewed:

Mothers were interviewed once and this was part of a bigger study which looked at Socio-cultural realities of following through with PMTCT in a rural community

3. Inclusion criteria:

Mothers had to be HIV positive, breastfeeding and with babies above 2 months.

4. Purposive sampling of mothers:

Mothers with challenges only sampled. This is a very good point and we acknowledge it as one of the limitations of the study.

5. The quantification of themes:

Thank you for noting this and it has been revised in the main document

6. Limitations:

The limitation on lack of generalisability has been included

7. Presentation of multiple references with the same bracket:

Thank you. This has been noted and addressed
8. Consistency in referencing style e.g. line 164:

Thank you. This has been addressed.

9. Spelling out Acronym the first time it is used:

This has been addressed.

10. Addition of breastfeeding to enhance visibility of article:

Thank you for the suggestion. This has been addressed.

11. Addition of adherence to infant feeding practices as a component of PMTCT:

This has been added.

12. Specificity about the qualitative design:

This was a descriptive phenomenological study looking at experiences of women, we have stated in the document.

13. Decision to interview only 15 women:

This was part of a bigger study which was looking at Socio-cultural realities of following through with PMTCT in a rural community. A detailed understanding and narratives of mothers who were struggling to adhere was therefore necessary to understand the phenomena. Out of the 108 breastfeeding mothers who were on PMTCT during the study period, 18 were identified as having challenges and 15 volunteered to participate. The further explanation is documented in the protocol.

14. Referencing on stigma:

This has been addressed in the document.

15. Importance of gender in the study and positionality:

The data collectors were 3 females and one male. (see positionality)

16. Respondents:

Thank you for the suggestion. Respondents have been moved to results section.

17. Procedures:

Renamed ethical considerations.
18. Data analysis:

Thank you for noting this. Data analysis procedures were informed by Braun and Clarke, 2006.

19. Thematic analysis:

Superordinate and subordinate used

20. Themes not matching:

Thank you for the suggestion this has been addressed

21. Differentiation between institutional barriers:

Thank you for the suggestion, this has been addressed

22. Distrust of clinic advice on breastfeeding by HIV positive mothers:

Idea further explained as per suggestion.

23. Mandatory Exclusive breastfeeding:

The rural women were not given an option when it came to infant feeding

24. Divorce quote:

It is more about being expelled from the home. This has been clarified.

25. Side effects discussion:

This has been taken care of

26. Overall Comment:

Once again, thank you for the valuable inputs which indeed are meant to improve the overall quality of the article. Your efforts are greatly appreciated.