



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_17293
Title of the Manuscript:	Health system barriers and facilitators influencing TB/HIV integration in Ghana
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Please see below : Major concerns - The majority of those interviewed were patients however, the results report only one patient quote and there are no themes that seem to be patient specific. This to me is a major weakness and seems like the study could have been done by interviewing only healthcare personnel and no patients. - Furthermore in the conclusion it is stated: "Further studies are also needed to explore patient-related barriers to and facilitators of TB/HIV integration." However 18 patients were interviewed. Was it not also the purpose of the study to understand patient-related barriers/facilitators? - From the results and discussion it is not clear or convincing that this was an ethnographic study. Ethnographic research should take into account the culture, environment, and social systems etc using field notes and observation as well. There is still no citation for the method used in this study. Only the word Ethnographic was added. Other qualitative methods can use interviews for data collection. Minor - Abstract could still be improved - I still think that design and setting belong within methodology rather than separate. Under methodology there is more information about setting which should be presented together. One-on-one interviews does not need to be stated twice. Combining these separate sections would remedy. - There are still English grammar issues. - Twenty nine participants made up of ...were identified – you mean participated in the interviews not only identified?	Major concerns - More patient quotes have been included where relevant to support the various health system themes used to present the results and the discussion. - The sentence has been duly revised to address the concern raised. - Following further reading, authors find interpretivism as a more appropriate description of the qualitative approach used in the study. Interpretivism does not rely on the researcher being totally immersed in the setting but relies on people, and their interpretation, perceptions, meanings and understandings as the primary source of data. Minor - The authors agree with the reviewer that design and setting belong to methodology but this has been done according to the author guidelines and the manuscript template available on the journal website. If inclusion of the two sections under methodology in the abstract is acceptable to the journal editors, then the authors would do so. - Could the reviewer be more specific as to which grammar issues and where these can be found so that these can be addressed individually? 'identified' has been replaced with 'participated in the study'



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

- Unclear why reference 9 is not at the end of the sentence.
- This sentence is not necessary I recommend removing and have only purpose statement. You can indicate affiliation or acknowledgment of support if appropriate: **This paper was part of a PhD programme that used a mixed methods approach to evaluate the TB/HIV services in Ghana.**
- Ethnographic methodology needs to be added to abstract and also should have citation within text to be clear on method you followed to conduct study.
- Adding the following sentence to abstract would be clearer than the sentence in line 22-24: **Three urban district hospitals with three different service delivery models with increasing levels of integration were purposively selected as study sites**
- Additional tables are good additions and help clarify. Although very interesting I am not sure Table 6 adds anything to the results unless they are used to discuss the results.
- Research method – in general it is in-depth or semi-structured individual interviews rather than one-on-one. In-depth will be mostly open ended questions. It is still unclear what type of interviews were conducted.
- Line 164: making it difficult to plan with effectively – plan effectively remove with.
- Line 174: while others attended training for the allowance. What do you mean by allowance? Does salary increase with increased training?
- Statistics and information does not seem like the appropriate term – Is this Program evaluation or Reporting or separate recording and reporting systems rather than statistics and information?
- The following additions in discussion do not reflect on the findings in this study – how written this only reports on findings from other studies. Human resource barriers included overburdened and poorly motivated staff, and a high rate of staff attrition [15-17, 24, 25]. This results in long waiting times [17], and missed opportunities to offer TB/HIV services [26].

- This error has been corrected: reference 9 has been moved to the end of the sentence.
- The sentence has been removed.
- Interpretivism has been included in the abstract and a citation included under methodology in the main text.
- The highlighted sentence has been included in the abstract as suggested.
- Table 6 was added in response to another reviewer's comments to include some socio-demographic data of patients.
- Semi-structured interviews were used. The suggested correction has therefore been effected.
- 'with' has been removed.
- The allowance refers to the travel allowance paid to participants of these training programmes at the end of the training. It is not part of salaries. This has been clarified in the text.
- The error has been duly corrected. 'Statistics and information' has been changed to 'Information systems' to reflect the key components of a well-functioning health system as outlined in the introduction.
- The sentences have been revised, addressing the concern raised.

Thank you for your comments.