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Reviewer’s report:

The authors’ decision to revise the paper to present only the pre-intervention data and offer a comparison of the results between HIV+ and HIV- study participants makes this a clearer, stronger paper. Moreover, the authors have adequately addressed all other suggested revisions from the two reviewers. At this stage, I have only a few discretionary revisions for the authors to consider:

1. On page 13, the last two sentences of the last paragraph ("Among the most commonly stated...") seem out of place given that the sentences immediately before and after them have to do with the safety of the IUD for HIV+ women. Consider presenting these sentences elsewhere in the Discussion.

2. In the Discussion section on page 14, the “fear of procedures” is introduced for the first time as an obstacle to LAPM use; would be good to mention this factor in the Results section as well.

3. The first sentence of the first paragraph on page 15 ("Our findings revealed...") is a bit awkward. I believe the authors are trying to make the point that providers heavily influence clients' use of contraception, but then they proceed to point out that only half of clients had talked about FP with their providers. Yet, the results show that ~90% of clients are contracepting. The logic here isn't clear.

4. The authors did a good job of explaining the benefits of LAPMs, particularly in light of the fertility intentions of the study population. However, given the very high rates of injectable contraceptive use, the discussion would also benefit from a couple of sentences explaining the potential shortcomings of such heavy reliance on this particular method (e.g., failure rates, resupply, etc).

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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