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Reviewer's report:

Dear Editors,

The authors appear to have done a good job with the majority of the revisions of the manuscript. Aside from a couple of typos listed below, I have only two points that I believe must be addressed and they pertain to the author's response to my 10th point in their letter (3.10 top of page 4 referring to text page 22, 2nd para, last line).

Major compulsory revisions

I return to what I called a non-sequitor. The paragraph needs to be rewritten so that the sentence beginning "Instead, the strong correlation between lack of ARV knowledge..." is no longer almost 4 lines long. Its awkward and the sentence that follows, that refers to Ghanaian women's risky behavior is still a non-sequitor. You are claiming that lack of ARV knowledge is associated with hypothetical refusal to take ARVs. The other study is not about ARVs, its about HIV prevention knowledge and and risky behavior. Just because both studies were about religion, you can't claim relatedness. Women engage in risky behaviors, including multiple sexual partners, for a variety of reasons including managing their day-to-day survival, regardless of their HIV prevention knowledge. This last sentence should be dropped.

Secondly, the quality of the discussion section is flawed by the presentation of new references (articles not previously mentioned) in the discussion section. All of the references 18-28 appear for the first time in the discussion section. No new material should be introduced at that point in a manuscript. They should first appear in the literature review and then be referred to again in the discussion. Correcting this would be easy, it just means inserting a couple of appropriate paragraphs in the literature review that address these references.

'Minor essential revisions',

Typos:
p. 9, line 6 change "where" to 'were'
p. 13, 2nd para, line 9, change 'that' to 'than'

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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