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**Reviewer’s report:**

In general, this is a well written and thought provoking article. The messages were clear and informative for health intervention development.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------

**Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)**

**Methods:**
More detail on methods would be helpful. How was sampling done? Why were these people chosen? (Purposive, theoretical, convenience?) Are they emblematic of those seeking HIV care? How is this clinic similar or different to others in terms of the client base. Gender imbalance is significant – especially because there are big differences in the way that men and women communicate (with and without the help of ICT).

What theoretical approach guided analysis?

Do we have info on SES? Age? Tech use often varies by income and education and age. More information on who these participants are and how much they mirror the HIV/AIDSs population in Peru would be helpful.

**Results:**
The results do not follow the interview guide! For instance, what did you learn about PDA’s?

A sub-heading about the Internet (similar to cell phone) would be helpful to orient the reader. It would also be helpful to have similar stats related here (level of internet use, etc). What sites where popular? Which features did people use? This would be particularly interesting to explore.

More detail would be helpful in this section to contextualize the data. Where was there consensus? Where were the points of disagreement?

-----------------------------------------------------------------------

**Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)**

**Minor Revisions**

**Intro**
“Secondary HIV transmission prevention (i.e., from HIV-positive to HIV-negative individuals) has been neglected [7], and evidence-based ‘prevention with positives’ counseling models [8] have not yet been widely adapted in many resource-constrained settings [9].” -- I think this statement is a little bit strong. Rather than neglected – perhaps under-utilized? Impressive work in the area of secondary prevention is now being done in many settings in sub-Saharan Africa (and other places)!

Grammar: Persons in Peru who are living with, and at risk for, HIV infection also are using these technologies on their own initiative – though sometimes in ways that may facilitate HIV transmission risk, such as to arrange unprotected sexual encounters.

**Discussion:**
A section about strengths and limitations that contextualize the data would help.
This statement is missing references: Other researchers have reported that people living with HIV who use the Internet for health care indicated that they experienced improved knowledge about the illness, increased skills in coping, and support from others.

The authors mention several online resources available in Peru – did these come up in the interviews? What were the perceptions of existing online material? In addition to working towards developing cell phone interventions – what lessons are there here for developers of e-health content? How does Peru differ from other contexts in Latin America that might help to contextualize the data?

**What next?**: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**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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