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Response to reviewers.

We would like to thank all the reviewers for the thoughtful and constructive comments. We feel that our paper has been strengthened as a result of these. Below is a detailed reply to the reviewers, point-by-point.

Reviewer 1: Sarah Flicker

General Comments.

Major Compulsory Revisions.

1) Methods. Sampling was performed by convenience in two clinics. Participants were demographically similar to those receiving care in both clinics. Both of these clinics primarily serve male clients (100% at Impacta, approximately 80% at Via Libre).
2) We used a content analysis approach. This analysis intended to understand the information needs, motivations, and behaviors of people living with HIV or ART in Lima.
3) Info on SES and age. Those data were added.
4) Results. We added a paragraph about use and perceptions of PDA’s.
5) Results 2: Subheadings and more text were added.

Minor Essential Revisions
1) Suggestion was included and a new reference was added.
2) Grammar was improved.
3) Discussion 1: A section about strengths and limitations was added.
4) Discussion 2: Reference was added.
5) Unfortunately, those links did not come up during the interviews.

Reviewer 2: Francisco Bastos

General Comments.

Major Compulsory Revisions.

1) A paragraph regarding digital exclusion/access to the Internet was included in the discussion (3rd paragraph, page 9).
2) Gender issues. Participants were demographically similar to those receiving care in both clinics. Both of these clinics primarily serve male clients (100% at Impacta, approximately 80% at Via Libre). We don’t know the percentage of access to the Internet in FSW since the target group in this project was not FSW.
3) Source of messages. We probed the possibility of receiving text messages sent by a health care provider or by the clinic.
4) We included the suggested reference and we discussed the issue of confidentially in more detail.
5) The sentence related with “may facilitate HIV transmission risk” was deleted for clarity. Therefore, references related with Sherer were not included.
Minor Essential Revisions

1) Sentence including “Variation in the information behaviors” was deleted for clarity.

Reviewer 3: Helene Antoine Claire Marie Voeten

Major Compulsory Revisions.

1) The results section has been re-structured and re-written. Three headings have been added, namely “Internet”, “cell phones” and “PDA”.
2) Sampling procedure has been described in the methods section (convenience sample). A section including limitations was included.
3) The title has been modified according to the reviewer.
4) A sentence was added at the end of the Internet section. Some people had negative experiences regarding the Internet being overwhelming, potential of misinformation and being a waste of time and money.
5) Partner notification: A paragraph was added in the discussion.

Minor Essential Revisions

1) Abstract: Paragraph regarding main results on all 3 technologies was modified.
   Background was shortened.
2) Background: HIV prevalence of sex workers in Peru has been added.
3) ART was used consistently.
4) Reference has been included.
5) The following change was made: “based on a published article by Flicker et al.”, as suggested.
6) Page 7: Suggestion was added.
7) Discussion. Sentence was deleted for clarity.
8) Reference has been included.
9) Replacement was made.
10) Table 2 and 3 were relabeled according to reviewer’s suggestion.

Discretionary Revisions

1) Reviewer’s suggestion was accepted.
2) Page 7. We are including official numbers regarding proportion of people who have access to the Internet and cell phones.
3) Table 1. We are including the guide that we used. Therefore, we cannot change it at this point.

We appreciate the opportunity to improve this manuscript with the reviewers’ helpful comments.