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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Tovah Honor Aronin, PhD
Editor, BMC Women's Health
June 30, 2019

Dear Dr. Aronin,

Please consider our original article entitled ‘Female perspectives on male involvement in a human-papillomavirus-based cervical cancer screening program in western Kenya’ for publication in BMC Women's Health. We have included revisions, that we believe have added clarity and strengthened the paper.

Sincerely,

Konyinsope Adewumi

Edits made:
The page number and line numbers of the edits correspond with the following settings:
- Track changes
- All markup
- Show only comments and formatting in balloons
Reviewer reports:
Kedra Wallace (Reviewer 2):
(Not provided)

Francis Obare (Reviewer 1):
The paper is now very much improved. There are just a few issues for the authors to consider further.

A. METHODS

1) Second paragraph, second statement (page 5, line 137): Delete "women" after "results".
Response: Thank you for your feedback. This change has been made.

2) Second paragraph, last statement (page 5, line 141): Change "and reached 72" to "but successfully interviewed 72".
Response: Thank you for your feedback. This change has been made.

B. RESULTS

1) First paragraph (page 6, line 184): Change "the partner permission" to "the partner's permission".
Response: Thank you for your feedback. This change has been made.

2) Fifth paragraph under proposed facilitators, second statement (page 12, line 339): Delete "matter" from the statement.
Response: Thank you for your feedback. This change has been made.

3) Sixth paragraph under proposed facilitators, first statement (page 12, line 346): Change "to the community" to "in the community".
Response: Thank you for your feedback. This change has been made.

4) Framework: In spite of the changes, the framework still does not come out as explicitly as expected. The authors should create a separate section just before the discussion section where they explicitly talk about the framework in response to the issues that were previously raised (refer to previous comments regarding the framework). It is essentially helping the reader understand Figure 1. It is also in this section that the authors should specify that Figure 1 be inserted e.g. by using the phrase "Insert Figure 1 about here". Given that illustrations are submitted separately, this gives the editor a rough idea of where to insert the figure - which should be as close to the text that describes it as possible - should the paper be accepted for publication. In its current form, the framework presented in the figure is just floating somewhere without clarity of how and where it fits in the paper. There is no explicit text that describes what the figure is all about, including the elements that constitute it, how the findings feed into those elements, how the elements help us understand male involvement in cervical cancer programs, and how researchers can operationalize the elements for replication elsewhere. Although having read the paper multiple times I have a clear sense of how this should be written up, it is up to the authors to help the reader understand their framework.

Response (page 12, lines 349-357): Thank you for your feedback. We added the following paragraph at the end of the Results section.
“Framework Creation and Utilization:
[Insert Figure 1 here]

We used the perspectives of the participants to identify key themes, which informed the development of a cervical cancer prevention specific framework for male involvement. In particular, we sought to highlight where men were felt to impact the cervical cancer prevention process, including cervical cancer education, screening, results notification, and treatment. The various actions that served as barriers and facilitators mentioned with respect to each event highlighted in the cascade analyzed and explained in the text of this paper, are summarized in Figure 1. “Drivers” were included to summarize the perceived causes or influencers of experienced or perceived barriers/facilitators. We included a category for “post treatment adherence” because of the large amount of data that emerged regarding barriers to post-treatment adherence.”

C. DISCUSSION

1) First paragraph, last statement (page 13, lines 373-375): Give a few examples of the ways being alluded to so that the statement is not left hanging the way it is in its current form.
Response: (page 13, lines 373-375) Thank you for your feedback. “such as encouraging or permitting women to seek care.” Has been added to the end of the statement.