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Reviewer's report:

Review

Overall, this is a very nicely written paper on an important topic. Post-partum care is often completely overlooked in HIV-positive women. Some items are unclear particularly in the abstract and the abstract does not match the manuscript and the objectives well.

MAJOR REVISIONS:

ABSTRACT

I recommend re-writing of much of the Abstract
Eg – word “women” missing after HIV-positive in Background.
Add in Background that also looked at correlation with intention of pregnancy

I am unclear how actual “access to family planning” was assessed – maybe it is just use of family planning methods

Provide more details in methods of abstract – ran from when to when? What proportion of patients were from Kenya + Swaziland + how many in this analysis. Also unclear i abstract that participants were HIV+ and HIV-negative. Add brief description of statistical methods in abstract.

Results – provide number of participants, both HIV+ and HIV-negative; some demographics eg age, marital status, education, where did they live – urban vs. Rural. Don’t comment on fertility desires in abstract but is commented on in Background, so add. Add p-values. There is lots of good results in the Tables to add in here.

Conclusion – I think the conclusion could be stronger – ie family planning counselling can be linked to prenatal, peripartum and postpartum care

METHODS

There is no statistical analysis section – consider adding a statistician as team member

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS
INTRODUCTION
Many importance sentences are missing references

METHODS
Where is the paragraph with correlations

TABLES
Presentation quite confusing – can yo make it clearer

BMC requirement
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? YES
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? NO
3. Are the data sound? YES
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? YES
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? YES
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? YES
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? YES
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? NO
9. Is the writing acceptable? YES

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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