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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. The authors state that enrollment interviews were conducted at TASO health facility (page 6) therefore I assume subsequent interviews including observation visits using a checklist were done at participants home. This point should be clarified including how confidentiality was maintained during the home visits (confidentiality issues are only mentioned during the coding process). It is stated in the paper that stigma is a concern among PLHIV therefore it would be useful to understand how the interviewers went about conducting IDIs/home observation visits without causing undue stress.

A related question: What was the purpose of the home observation visits?

2. More information is needed on the analysis process. Who conducted the analysis? Was it one researcher or two/more? How was agreement reached on intercoding compatibility?

3. It would be useful if the authors summarized the analysis section it is way too long.

4. The results section lacks logical flow of themes and sub titles. Important information is all mixed up in the different sub titles. The authors should endeavor to build the results section in a sequential manner. For instance I strongly feel that there should be a subtitle on sero-sorting as the theme keeps on emerging in the paper. Maybe also change subtitle on page 18 and if data allows include information on fertility desires. If the changes are made then the sub title could read “Hope for the future and desire for children”.

6. More clarification and qualifying information is needed in a number of sentences. At times the explanations provided do not tally with the quotations creating confusion or contradictory statements (see page 11 first paragraph and third paragraph; page 16 second paragraph)

7. Several paragraphs in the discussion section are unclear and the authors need to address this critically. Similarly, the conclusion section does not offer any new information/recommendations, what is discussed here is a repetition of information appearing in the discussion section.

- Minor Essential Revisions
1. A shortened methods section would give the authors the luxury of putting socio-demographic information in the methods section.
2. What necessitated the participant refusal after being involved in all rounds of interviews?

3. There are grammatical and syntax errors and awkward word choices throughout the manuscript. I recommend a thorough edit. Words such as ‘sexual appetite’, ‘safe sex’ and ‘distribute their children’ are repeatedly used in the paper.

4. Was CD4 count recorded at month 30? It would be interesting to know if the “healthy feeling” was reflected with changes in the biological measures.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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