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ARTICLE TITLE: INCREASING RETENTION OF HIV POSITIVE PREGNANT AND BREASTFEEDING MOTHERS ON OPTION-B PLUS BY UPGRADING AND PROVIDING FULL TIME HIV SERVICES AT A LOWER HEALTH FACILITY IN RURAL UGANDA

Responses to reviewer’s comments

First of all, we would like to thank you both reviewers for the comments on our manuscript. We have attempted to address all the comments to the best of our knowledge. Please see the changes in the text and our responses are listed

Abstract

1) Methods: Change “Questionnaires were administered and four focus group discussions were held. We used descriptive statistics to understand characteristics of mother s and multivariable logistic regression model for quantitative data. Thematic analysis was used to analyze qualitative data. Analyses were performed using SPSS version 23.”
“Questionnaires were administered and four focus group discussions were held. We used descriptive statistics to understand characteristics of mothers and a multivariable logistic regression model for quantitative data with the aid of SPSS version 23. Thematic analysis was used to analyze qualitative data.”

2) Result: Delete “A total of 132 HIV positive pregnant and breastfeeding mothers were included in the study.” It is already stated in the methods.

Change “Majority 47 (35.6%)” to “About a third (35.6%)”

A total of 132 HIV positive mothers were included in the study deleted

Majority 47 (35.6%)” changed to “About a third (35.6%)” Page 2

3) Majority/More than half of all the women or those retained?

Changed to majority of all mothers Page 2

4) 26 (IQR 23). IQR of 23 with median of 26 is very suspicious. What was the minimum and maximum age?

We have included the minimum and maximum age as 16 minimum and 39 maximum Page 2

5) Lack of disclosure of HIV status’’ ……To who?

Changed to lack of disclosure of HIV status to spouse Page 2
6) Page 6: How was the 132 selected from the 200?

Consecutive sampling was used, this was now clarified in the text on pages 4 & 5

7) How many of retained and non-retained women were selected? Were these numbers predetermined? Yes or No. Justify whichever applies

During analysis, of quantitative results, 116 were retained and 16 were non-retained. We did not predetermine the retained and not retained women. It is only in qualitative FGDs that we ensured equal representation

8) Authors should talk about how and why they selected the independent variables and also endeavour to state how AOR variables were selected.

This has been described in text; the independent variables were selected basing on prior literature reviewed. This guided us in selection of likely factors influencing retention in HIV care. Variables with p<0.2 after bivariate analysis were selected for multivariable analysis page 6

9) Who are “active and none-active HIV positive mothers”? Do they correspond to retained and non-retained? If yes, stick to a term. If no, define

This has been improved throughout the document, we have taken retained and none retained.

10) Move and incorporate the first five lines into your methodology. Avoid duplication in the methods section. They don’t belong to results.

The first five lines on under results section have been removed. Page 6
11) Majority, 116 (87.9%) of the HIV positive mothers were retained in HIV care.” This statement can only be meaningful if the 132 were selected in a random manner from the register in the health centres. That’s why you should clarify your sampling procedures as requested earlier.

The statement has been improved from “Majority” to “About” Page 6

12) While the ORs of individual levels and site levels can be computed and stated separately as it is, the AOR cannot be analysed separately. Authors should put all variables significant, at say 20% or 10% in a single multiple logistic regression model to determine the AORs.

All variables significant after bivariate analysis have been analyzed in a single multivariable logistic regression model and results put in single table 1 and the text in the result section have been reworded/improved accordingly Page 7