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- Major Compulsory Revisions
  1. Methodology:
     a. This section was poorly written. Author did not describe what the “both independent groups” were – this needs clarification.
     b. The coding of Inconsistent condom use seems to be wrong: Authors coded 0 for “Yes” (consistent condom use), and 1 for “No” (inconsistent condom use). If the outcome was inconsistent condom use, then this should have been coded 1 (and should be “yes”, condom use was inconsistent).
     c. No description of what the Independent variables (socio-demographic, relational and behavioural factors) were.
     d. In the 2nd paragraph in the Methods section, authors mention that “Interview administered technique” was employed. Please re-write! This sounds unscientific.
  2. Analysis:
     a. The analysis section was hard to find (there should be a heading “Analysis”).
     b. Authors went straight to mentioning bivariate analyses without mentioning any comparisons between groups, significant differences between groups etc (i.e. how they came about Table 1).
     c. Authors mention “about fifty percent and one fourth of the respondents in both groups...”. This is vague, confusing and unscientific. You also need to specify number and percentage of variables [n (%)] for clarity.

1. Results:
a. Under Characteristic of the sample section, authors mention ART naive and ART experienced group without any previous mention of whom they i.e. what makes a person ART naive and what makes him/her ART experienced - this could help the reader assimilate the paper easily.

2. Discussion:

a. The discussion section needs to be totally re-written with proper cross-referencing e.g. reference was made several times to a study done at Jimma specialized hospital. The manuscript would benefit from more professional writing if it is to be published, with better cross-referencing with previous studies.

- Minor Essential Revisions

There were quite a lot of minor discrepancies with this manuscript, some of which are:

1. Providing abbreviations before definitions. E.g. the authors write PLWHA, ART, and not explaining the abbreviation or several paragraphs later mentioning what the abbreviation stands for. There were several such that made it a hard-read.

2. The manuscript would benefit immensely from thorough language editing, as the manuscript contained spelling mistakes, incoherent sentences, to many to list.

- Discretionary Revisions

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

**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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