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Title of paper:

Perspectives on implant use in women living with HIV in Cape Town, South Africa: a qualitative study among primary healthcare providers and stakeholders

Dear Editor,

On behalf of my co-authors, I am pleased to again resubmit this manuscript, which was considered by a third reviewer and deemed in need of minor revisions, for publication in BMC Public Health. We include responses to the points made by the editor and third reviewer with page and line numbers in the manuscript text indicated.

Yours sincerely,

Anna Brown, MPH
University of Cape Town

Catherine Rice, PhD for Megan Barling (Editor, BMC Public Health):

1. Please remove any files from the file inventory that you do not wish to see published.
- All files other than the final amended manuscript and this response letter have been removed.

2. Please use (unique) initials only rather than family names in the Authors' contributions section.

- Thank you, corrected on Lines 481 to 486, Page 21.

3. At this stage, please upload your proofread manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethrough or text in different colours. All relevant tables and figures should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files. Should you wish to respond to these revision requests, please include the information in the designated input box only.

- Thank you. We have done this.

Bola Lukman Solanke, PhD (Reviewer 3):

The study explored the impact of official guidance on contraceptive implant use among women living with HIV in Cape Town. The study has important implication for public health by strengthening the debate on the desirability of implant use in the context of efavirenz-based ART. The methodology adopted was sufficient to achieve the aim of the study. However, the background should have a clearly stated objective. Though, this was implied by the gap the study intends to fill.

- Thank you for this supportive feedback.

Lines 101-106, Page 5 now read:

“The objective of this study is to explore South African primary healthcare providers’ perceptions, knowledge and practice concerning implant provision in the context of HIV and ART. Primary healthcare providers’ perspectives are contextualised by those of policy, academic and clinical stakeholder experts working in HIV and/or contraceptive care. “

Please note: Some minor editorial changes were made during the final proof reading, including slight grammatical adjustments for readability and removal of abbreviations previously included but subsequently deleted from the body of the article.

In the abstract on Page 2, Line 39, the phrase ‘other pressures on providers to deliver multiple integrated services in busy healthcare facilities’ has been replaced with ‘other pressures related to provider capacity’.