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We thank the editor and reviewers for their helpful comments and the opportunity to resubmit this manuscript again after the small revisions.

Editor Comments:

-- In the section 'Funding', please also describe the role of the funding body/bodies in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.
RESPONSE: We have amended the ‘Funding’ section to state that the funding body has no role in the design of the study and data collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript:

This work is based on the research supported by the National Research Foundation of South Africa (Grant Numbers: 113422) and the Wellcome Trust core grant 082384/Z/07/Z to the Africa Health Research Institute. Opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this manuscript are that of the authors, and the funders accept no liability whatsoever in this regard.

--Please consider the list of authors as it currently stands with reference to our guidelines regarding qualification for authorship (http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship).

> We have noted that author SS and NN is missing in the listed authors' contributions.

RESPONSE: We have now listed all author initials clearly in the ‘Authors’ Contributions’ section. We now state:

DG conceived the study and its design in consultation with JS and prepared the first draft of the manuscript. SB, NN, SN and JS provided comments on drafts, and read, edited and approved the final manuscript.

> Anna Meyer-Weitz is not currently on the manuscript authorship list but is included in the authors’ contribution statement.

RESPONSE: Thank you for pointing out the ambiguity of our statement. We have taken out Anna Meyer-Weitz’s name in the author’s contribution statement as we realized that she did not contribute towards the manuscript to meet the criteria for authorship. However, we have acknowledged her in the ‘Acknowledgements’ section. We now state:

We thank Prof Anna Meyer-Weitz for her study supervision and support.

> Currently, the contributions of authors JS and Anna Meyer-Weitz do not automatically qualify them for authorship. In the section “Authors’ contributions”, please provide further clarifications on their contributions, and see our guidelines for authorship below.
RESPONSE: Thank you for referring us to the authorship guidelines. We have now provided further clarifications on JS contribution in the “Authors’ Contributions” section, as shown above. JS has made substantive intellectual contributions in the study conceptualization and design. JS also revised and approved the final manuscript. As noted above, Anna-Meyer-Weitz is no longer listed as an author.

Reviewer reports:

Jantina De Vries (Reviewer 1): I would like to congratulate the authors on their comprehensive response to the many issues raised by the reviewers. Your manuscript has improved as a result and I am happy to recommend it for publication. It will make an interesting contribution to the literature.

RESPONSE: Thank you very much.

Jennifer Ilo Van Nuil, Ph.D. (Reviewer 2): The paper is much improved.

Few minor points:

The introduction reads well but is a bit long.

RESPONSE: Thank you for pointing out that our introduction reads well. While we agree that it is a bit long, however, we believe a detailed introduction is important to this complex phenomenon of dyad research in low-middle-income countries and we have chosen not to make any further changes.

I suggest to use active voice throughout the paper.

RESPONSE: Thank you for this suggestion. We have now gone through the manuscript carefully and adjusted some of the text to use more of the active voice.
Lines 289 and 375 are redundant, consider stating this only once.

RESPONSE: We agree that lines 289 and 375 are repetitive. We retained line 289 and deleted line 375.

Line 628 - are you really after the "truth" or just after people's versions of their realities/lived experiences? I think you address this point in the discussion but in this line it reads as if you are trying to find one truth.

RESPONSE: We have taken out line 628 as we realized that indeed we were not after the ‘truth’.