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**Author’s response to reviews:**

1) I would work on streamlining the introduction and methods (and try to organize the methods a bit more clearly). Some details in the methods could be moved to an appendix if needed
   Response: The introduction has been streamlined. Some of the sections have been merged. Page 4

2) Table 2, Figure 2, and Figure 3 are not clear and need to be revised and match what is being described in the text
   Response: We have revised Table 2, and Figures 2 and 3. to make them clearer. Page 15-16

3) I would incorporate some the contextual details provided in the author's responses into the discussion as well
   Response:
   We have incorporated this detail into the discussion. Page 22

 **Introduction:**

4) I think the first two paragraphs can be condensed into one (and do not need to mention sustainability here).
   Response: We have condensed this section into one paragraph as suggested. Page 4
5) Third and fourth paragraph could also be condensed into. Discuss the initial study, plans for sustainability, and the need to evaluate where it was successful.  
Response: This has been reduced and combined as described clearly. Page 5

6) I think intro now has the key parts but I still might recommend streamlining it.  
Response: Thank you. We have streamlined the writing of the manuscript to make it clearer.

Methodology:

7) Would put study setting info under study design  
Response: We have moved the study setting under the study design section. Page 7

8) Would shorten initial intervention description. I think making sure the distinction is clear between when you are referring to the initial study vs. the current sustainability study is important (or describing intervention period vs. sustainability period).  
Response: This has been clearly described under the section on the intervention. Page 8

9) I was still confused when reading the methods. After describing the initial study design and initial intervention…I think it might be better to split up quantitative and qualitative aspects of the study. Under each you can describe population (participant description and sampling), study procedures/measurements, and analysis  
Response: We have separated/split the qualitative study design from the quantitative designs.  
Quantitative section page 8-11  
Qualitative design pages 12-14

10) Overall, there is a lot of detail in the methods that in the end reduce the clarity (e.g., description of the initial intervention). For example, for describing the sampling of the charts…this sentence is the most important "we used a systematic sampling method basing on probability proportional to size, in which each health center contributed a pre-determined sample size." The remaining details about the fishbowl randomization, etc. could be in appendix. I would urge the authors to think about the key information that is needed to understand the methods and consider putting the remainder in an appendix (not just this section but through all the methods).  
Response: We have streamlined the methods sections and removed some of the detailed information.

Results:  
11) I don't think it is necessary to put the missing data in the text (can put the number in the table). I covariates to help explain what is associated with rapid ART initiation in the sustainability period.
Response: We have removed the missing data from the text and commented about it in the Table. Table 2

12) What is described in the text and what is shown in Table 2 do not match up. The text describes unadjusted and adjusted analyses for the overall population and Table 2 seems to show the results by different subgroups. These should match. And I would choose to present either a risk ratio or risk difference.
Response: We changed the text description of what is shown in table 2 to match together. Page 15

13) I like the forest plot, but am not really sure what Figure 2 shows right now. The x-axis needs to be labeled and I would make it the percentage of patients who started by 14 days. I don’t know what the reference line represents. It also seems that in a lot of facilities, the percentage went down in the sustainability period (not statistically significant but there is a trend). I would also comment on the trends and not focus too much on statistical significance (essentially consider facilities qualitatively did better, did the same, and did worse). Once figure is fixed, it will be really great.
Response: We have labeled the X-axis as the percentage of patients who started on ART within 14 days of eligibility Figure 2

14) Figure 3 is also not clear and I couldn't interpret. For a time series, the dots could be the mean time to ART start (not categorized as they seem to be) and these would be binned over 1 week or 1 month periods. Otherwise they could be the percent starting within 14 days binned over similar period. And then have a lowess line to show the fit…and then a vertical line at the split between intervention and sustainability period. If the time to start are categorized, I would use a stacked bar graph for each year I guess.
Response: We have changed Figure 3 to include a stacked bar graph showing the trend in the proportion of patients initiated on ART with 14 days from the period of START-ART intervention to the sustainability period. Each bar graph represents 6 months duration

Discussion:

15) I think the discussion is pretty good at this point.
Response: We thank you for appreciating our discussion

16) The authors provided reasonable responses to the questions about contextualizing the result. Their responses do discuss important details that do help contextualize the results (treat-all, rapid ART pushes, were done only after the study period), so it would be good to integrate into discussion as well. I think that fits into a discussion about secular trends (which I didn't see). Doesn't have to be long, just mentioned
Response: Thank you once again for appreciating our discussion. We have included this in our discussion page. Page 23