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Reviewer's report:

General
That authors have considered all the points raised

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
The authors have misunderstood my HIV comments. To put it another way, they should do a separate analysis excluding those known to have HIV and check that their findings hold up. This could be mentioned in the discussion, if not reported in the results, to add strength to the findings.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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