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Reviewer's report:

The revision and accompanying letter have made a good attempt at responding to the concerns raised in the first review. However there are still some revisions:

Major Essential Revisions:
The objective of the paper doesn't match the hypothesis nor the primary outcome stated in the methods section

Introduction - is too long, it would be easier to read if it were only 3-4 paragraphs concluding in a clear statement of the objectives of the current paper, including mentioning any planned comparisons or group comparisons.

Methods:
Some results are misplaced into the methods (Paragraph 2)
A more general description of the model (paragraph 3 P7) would be easier for readers

Results:
Too long
There is no need to provide all the same numbers in the text that readers can find in the tables. General statements, following the same organization of the planned objectives stated in the introduction, would make the paper more meaningful.

Tables:
Titles of the tables should describe what the data is telling us, not must that these are (for instance) odds ratios
The format of the tables, the four columns to demonstrate timing of HIV status knowledge, is confusing. I realize this is in response to the first review, but it would be much more clear if an objective of the paper was to specifically describe any different seen by timing of HIV status awareness, and this was represented separately, not clumped together

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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