General Comments:

This is an interesting study on a relevant topic for Nepal, where there are not many publications on HIV testing; the study is based on secondary data (DHS) and the authors used the adequate methods (logistic regression with complex sampling) to answer to the main objective of the study. However, to be published several issues must be considered and the English must be revised.

Answer: Thank you so much for your time and effort to revise our manuscripts. This has surely improved the quality of our manuscript. The modifications we did are marked with red color in the manuscript.

Specific Comments:

1. **Title**: must indicate the type of study and/or the data used (DHS)
   Answer: Thank you so much for such a useful advice. We have modified our title (title, page 1)

2. **Abstract**: should have a fist paragraph on the context/relevance of the study
   Answer: We have added one sentence about the relevance of the study in the abstract (Abstract. page: 1; lines: 12-13)

3. **Introduction**: In the introduction the authors must explain the HIV situation in Nepal; is it a low or high risk country? What is the HIV prevalence and its main characteristics?
   Answer: We have added about the prevalence and its characteristics of HIV in the introduction section (Introduction, page: 1; lines:38-46)

   What is Nepal’s health profile? Most researchers know very little about Nepal, and this kind of information is crucial to understand the study’s context and to judge its potential contribution to current knowledge.
   Answer: We have added main health profile of Nepal (Introduction, page 1-2;lines:46-50 )

4. **Methods**

   In general, methods are well explained and without mistakes. However, the sentence in line 76 “Chi-square tests and t-test were utilized to assess the association between the explanatory variables and HIV testing” is not correct. T tests are not used to test associations. And later on, in the results section, we can’t find this t-test (only qui-square). The authors must explain or correct this sentence.
   Thank you so much for pointing out our mistake. We have removed the t-test from analysis methods (Data Analysis, page: 3;line:110)

   Another comment is that, in general, models are estimated separately for men and women, because literature suggests that men and women behave very differently in HIV issues. Usually papers on this subject (when data are from big data samples as it is for DHS), estimate two
different models for men and women; In my opinion it will be very useful to have also these type of results.

Thank you so much for your suggestion. Separate analysis was performed for males and females. We performed reanalysis of the data disaggregating all the result by sex and wrote the description, abstract and discussion accordingly. (Table 2, 3, 4). (Result, page: 4-8).

5. Results

In Table 2, I suggest to exclude the absolute number and to disaggregate data by sex. It is always interesting to look at possible differences in men and women
Answer: Yes, we have disaggregated data by sex (Table 2, page;4-5).

In table 3, gender and age are repeated; the text starting at line 111 is related to Table 4 but it is below table 3. I think that it will be better if there is a paragraph on Table 3 results, then Table 4 and then the paragraph on

Answer:
1. Duplication of age and gender has been removed (Table 3).
2. Description of table 3 is presented before table 3 (Result, page:5; ,line 146-150).

Table 4 results (otherwise we cannot understand why Table 3 is there).

In line 113- 114, the sentence “The highest odds ratio (OR) of HIV testing was observed among participants aged 24–29 years (AOR,114 2.17; CI, 1.61–2.90) and not those who aged 40–49 years” is not comprehensible.
Replaced it for example with: “The highest odds ratio (OR) for the odds of having been tested for HIV was observed among participants aged 24–29 years (AOR,114 2.17; CI, 1.61–2.90) when compared with aged 40–49 years”

Answer: This sentence is no more there. As separate models are made for males and females, discussion has been rewritten (Results, page:6 to 7; line 154-181).

Line 118, the sentence “Furthermore, HIV testing was significantly lower among those who had no formal schooling (AOR, 032; CI, 0.24–0.51)…. ……..“ is not correct. It should be: “Furthermore, the odds of being tested for HIV was significantly lower among those who had no formal schooling (AOR, 032; CI, 0.24–0.51)….

Answer: Thank you so much. We have rewritten this part as per new analysis (Results, page: 6 to 7; line 154-181).

Line 123, same comment as before
Line 127, same comment as before
Answer: Thank you so much. We have rewritten this part as per new analysis. (Results, page: 6 to 7; line 154-181).
Line 129, the R2 statistic is not very useful since the dependent variable is binary; use for example Hosmer and Lemeshow Test (it is available in SPSS).

Answer: We have included the value of Hosmer and Lemeshow Test in place of R2 for both modes (Table 4).

6. Discussion
Line 136. Include also the 95% CI related to the main outcome.
In my opinion, the results by sex must be estimate and then discussed here.

Answer: now, we have now calculated results by sex and discussed accordingly (Discussion, page 8-9; lines: 190-272)

The English should be revised; many sentences difficult to understand.
Answer: We have modified some mistakes.

7. Conclusions
This section must be rewritten; the authors simply repeat the results. They should go further with specific public health recommendations.

Answer: We have modified conclusion (page: 10; lines:282-288).