

Author's response to reviews

Title: Counselling on HIV and infant feeding: Challenges faced by nurse-counsellors in northern Tanzania.

Authors:

Sebalda C. Leshabari MPH (seolesh@yahoo.com)

Astrid Blystad PhD (Astrid.Blystad@isf.uib.no)

Marina M. de Paoli PhD (marina.de.paoli@fafo.no)

Karen M. Moland PhD (Karen.Moland@cih.uib.no)

Version: 3 **Date:** 13 June 2007

Author's response to reviews: see over

Sebalda Leshabari
Centre for International Health
University of Bergen
5021 Bergen, Norway

June 13, 2007

The Managing Editor
Human Resources for Health Journal
WHO

Attention: Dr. Daniel Shaw

Dear Editor,

**RE: Authors responses to reviews: MS ID: 1423754031213585. Title–
“Counselling on HIV and infant feeding: Challenges faced by nurse-counsellors
in northern Tanzania”**

I refer to your letter dated – 10th May, 2007 regarding few minor essential revisions on the manuscript referred to above.

I am happy to inform you that we have now completed addressing the few minor comments and concerns that were raised by the two reviewers. And the manuscript is now edited by the English editor. We thank the reviewers for their very constructive reviews and wonderful contribution they have made in this manuscript. Find below the few changes which have been made.

Reviewer 1 – Dr. Titilayo C. Abiona

1. *“The authors should remove the ‘demographics’ in the bracket after the FGD quotes.”* We have agreed with this valuable suggestion and we have removed the ‘demographics’ after the quotes in the manuscript. *See page 11 to 17.*

Reviewer 2 – Dr. Tanya Doherty

1. ***“There are too many sub-headings in the background section which could be reduced or taken out as background sections don’t typically have sub-headings.”*** This comment was considered very valuable and we have taken out all the sub-headings. This has contributed also in reducing the number of words in the manuscript. *Please, see from page 3 through page 7 under the ‘Background’.*
2. ***“There are some very long paragraphs in the methods section which makes this section difficult to read.”*** The authors appreciated this concern and the paragraphs are shortened now, not only in the ‘methods section’ but, also in the ‘background section’. *Please, see the background and the methods section of the manuscript.*
3. ***“The paper is now currently very long (7500 words) and I feel that it should be reduced through editing prior to publication – especially the results section could be edited to maintain the key findings.”*** The suggestion was considered very important and we have tried our best to edit and reduce some words, in particular the results section while, being very careful to maintain our key findings. We couldn’t do more reduction. The words are now 7,051 instead of 7, 500. Please see from page 11 to 17 of the manuscript.

Once more, thank you very much for your great efforts and the very valuable comments from these two incredible reviewers. We (authors) are very comfortable with the manuscript as it is now and we appreciate very much.

Yours sincerely,

Sebalda Leshabari

The corresponding author