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**Reviewer's report:**

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.

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

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.

**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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