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The authors have done a nice job responding to the comments and suggestions of the reviewers. This article will be a nice contribution to the literature. At this stage, I suggest just a couple of minor essential revisions:

1. In the Results section of the abstract, the authors state, "Women were more favourable towards the use of sterilization than the intrauterine device." Then, in the Conclusions section of the abstract, they state, "Given that HIV positive women were found to be more favourable to future use of the IUD..." I believe the distinction is that the former sentence is comparing attitudes of all women in the study, both HIV+ and HIV-, between sterilization and the IUD. The latter is comparing the attitudes between HIV+ women to HIV- women to just the IUD. However, that wasn't clear to me until I had read the whole manuscript. I suggest the authors clarify the distinction being made in the abstract.

In the Results section of the abstract, the sentence, "Women were more favourable towards the use of sterilization than the intrauterine device" has been revised to indicate current use of contraception: “A small percentage of women (6.44%) were using long acting and permanent methods, all of whom were using sterilization; however, it was found that poor knowledge regarding LAPMs is likely to be contributing to the poor uptake of these methods.” The second sentence remains unchanged

2. Removing the phrase "who were asked" from the 1st sentence of the 1st full paragraph on pg 15 would make that sentence clearer.

This sentence has been revised according to the reviewer’s suggestion: “The permanence of female sterilization was identified by 63.5% of interviewed women as a reason for not wanting to undergo the procedure, reasoning that must be fully respected.”

3. The 1st sentence of the paragraph that starts at the bottom of pg 15 (“Our findings revealed...”) would be clearer if split into two sentences.

This sentence has been revised as per the reviewer’s suggestion: “Our findings revealed the important influence that health care providers have over women’s use of contraceptive methods. Only about half of all participants reported having been told by a provider about contraceptive methods since last becoming pregnant, HIV positive women being even less likely to be so informed.”

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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