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Reviewer's report:

HIV serostatus and disclosure: implications for infant feeding practice in rural south Nyanza, Kenya

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting manuscript.

Discretionary Revisions

1. The research question is well defined.

2. The methods are described in detail and a bit too long.

3. The data is well presented. There are some missing data with some variables not adding up to the total number of mothers included in the study. The numbers for the same variables are different in tables 1, 2 and 3. For example, the variable “Place of delivery” the total number of women in table 2 is 277 while in table 3 it is 265. What is the explanation for these discrepancies?

4. The manuscript adheres to the standards of reporting on data. A few clarifications are needed: In table 1, the variable: “Male partner has other wives n(%) (n=247 women with a current male partner” is not clear.

In tables 1, 2 and 3 under the variable “Education” what is the rationale for lumping together the women with primary education and no formal education?

In Table 2,: The variable “Age group” has three sub-groups. Which is the reference group?

The variable “Number of ANC visits completed”, what was the rationale for dividing the group into those who had had 1 ANC visit and those who had 2 or more ANC visits? Is this in any way related to the number of recommended ANC visits in the study setting?

5. The discussion and conclusions are balanced. However, the conclusion is presented in a generalised manner yet the aim of the study was clearly spelt out and it focuses on infant feeding practice. The authors in their conclusion emphasise the “the need for health care workers and counselors to receive support in order to improve skills required for diagnosing, monitoring and managing psychosocial aspects of the care of pregnant and HIV positive women” and the infant feeding practice is watered down.
6. The authors acknowledge the limitations of the work some of which may be responsible for the missing data.

7. The authors have acknowledged previous work and in fact the reference list of 39 is a bit on the high side.

8. The title and abstract summarise the findings of the study.

9. The manuscript is well written and flows well. There are a few abbreviations first used without writing them in full for example: under section on Data collection, CCHA is used without having written it in full.

Under Results section, Multivariate logistic regression for effects of selected predictor variables on EBF practice, paragraph 2, second sentence: “HIV positive women who had disclosed ………or had of unknown……..” is not clear. I suggest delete the word “had” to make the sentence clear.
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