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Dear Reviewers

Re: Manuscript: "Feasibility of HIV Self-Screening in South Africa: A mixed methods study" - PUBH-D-18-02534

Thank you very much for taking the time to review our manuscript entitled Feasibility of HIV Self-Screening in South Africa: A mixed methods study.

Please see below the responses for each of the comments.

Reviewer 1

The authors did a great job of responding to reviewer comments. The updated paper is clearly written, and has important insights on the feasibility of HIVSS in South Africa. Some minor edits I found while re-reading:

Reviewer’s Comments Response

Abstract:

*(Line 23): Check numerator in 89%...

Thank you for this comment, we have corrected the error in the number.

Line 23

Introduction:
Thank you for this comment, we have corrected the spelling of the word.

Methods:

Thank you for this comment, we have corrected the spelling of the word.

(Line 147): Need space between "oncea

Thank you for this comment, we have corrected the error in the text.

(Line 168): What missing critical key variables were not included in the analysis?

Thank you for this comment, we revised the sentence to include the missing variables – demographics and preferred method of testing.

Although the manuscript has been revised, it is still not aligned with feasibility. The authors may want to consider defining feasibility or replacing 'feasibility' with usability which would better explain the findings of the manuscript.

Although the manuscript has been revised, it is still not aligned with feasibility. The authors may want to consider defining feasibility or replacing 'feasibility' with usability which would better explain the findings of the manuscript. Thank you for this comment, we have added the definition of feasibility.

Lines 70-71
Line 3 (Page 3): The word 'recommendss' is incorrectly spelt. Thank you for this comment, we have corrected the spelling of the word.

Line 44

Line 177 (Page 9): "feasibility of HIV screening" - this sub-heading does not represent the description provided in the paragraph below it. Consider revising sub-heading to sample population. Thank you for this comment, we have deleted the subheading.

Line 181.

Table 1 has invalid text. Thank you for this comment, we have included a word format of Table 1.

The conclusion section provides conclusion on acceptability, but the study objective was to assess feasibility. Thank you for this comment, the conclusion section has been revised.

We have also reviewed and revised the manuscript for clarity where necessary.

Thank you for reviewing the manuscript.

Yours Sincerely

Limakatso Lebina and the co-authors.