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Reviewer’s report:

The paper describes an important study looking at workforce patterns in the prevention of Mother to Child Transmission of HIV. It is worth to ask this question using a qualitative method. To my view there are few things which needs clarification to enable the reader to understand this work.

1. Work force pattern seems to be the main outcome of the study and carries the title of the study, it will be useful to add the definition of workforce pattern as it was used in this study. does it refer to workforce inadequacy as stated in page 3 line 40? does it refer to facilitators and barriers? or workforce needs?

Background:

2. Page 4 line 50 -55 "PMTCT programs were added to the national strategy for HIV/AIDS in 2004, following the World Health Organization's (WHO) recommended guidelines at the time (Option A)" this sentence implies that the WHO option A was recomended in 2004 or before, while in actual fact option A was recommended by the WHO in 2010.

3. Page 5 lines 7-12 "Additionally, under Option B, infants receive prophylaxis for 4-6 weeks regardless of feeding method, whereas with Option A they only received prophylaxis if the mother was breastfeeding" it is important to clarify if this was according to the country policy or WHO recommendation. According to the WHO Under option A infant it was also recommended to give infant prophylaxis for 4-6 weeks even if not breastfeeding, and continue prophylaxis beyond 6 weeks only if the mother was breastfeeding. it is important for the authors to check and clarify.

4. Page 12 line 8-9 "However, interviewees did have the opportunity to verify interviewer notes for accuracy". it will be useful to briefly explain how this was done, were the interviewees given the notes to read or the notes were read to them so that they could verify?
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