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HIV/AIDS status disclosure increases Public Health benefits in the long term in Uganda

Introduction
The paper investigated short and long term benefits of HIV disclosure. Of course, disclosure still remains a major problem in the spread of HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa due to the fear of the unknown. It is important that this paper addresses such issue. I am afraid that the design of this study is not appropriate.

However, my major concerns are expressed below.

Major compulsory revision

Abstract
1. Abstract should be restructured to follow – introduction, methods, results and conclusion. This will help to put the study in perspective. It does not really convey the message of the paper clearly in its present state. Again, I do not think that this journal approves this pattern of abstract

Methods
2. The design of this work is very faulty. Though the authors have raised it as a limitation, it has put the work out of context. The study was a cross-sectional study that collected data at a given point in time (mid Feb – mid April, 2008), but the data collected looked like a longitudinal data. Therefore, your study design should be longitudinal rather than cross-sectional. There is no way you collect data within that period of time and report such as if there was a follow up data collected after the first phase to see if there are changes over time. Currently as it is, the paper is not coherent and does not put the reader in perspective. Can you tell us how you determined the long term benefits after three months? Rather than short and long term outcomes, you may consider looking at disclosure in terms of benefits: - Negatives Vs positives and the implication for public health. This fits into the current design of the study.
3. There is need for a clear definition of the short term apart from just less than three months, and the long term.

4. Include a subsection on study setting

5. Pls can you give a strong rationale for mixing the age categories in your study (see study design and sample)

6. What are the precautionary measures to ensure reliability of data collected

Results

7. Did not present results in the manner expected of in a qualitative study. In each result, can you summarize and give some few quotes to buttress the points in each subsection? Expunge those direct statements in italics that are not the main quotes. Avoid too many quotes scattered in the test. Also, see pg 10, last quote - how do you mean by (Young woman talking to her mother), is this the designation of the respondent interviewed?

8. See page 15 c) Negative long term outcomes of disclosure - how do the quotes in this subsection reflect long term outcomes. The points expressed in this subsection are social issues generated from social interaction which is subject to change depending on the mood of the people involved in the interaction, and context.

9. See page 18, para 1, the authors compared short and long term outcomes of disclosure with increases in % in some cases - pls how did you generate the % from the qualitative data and why were these not reflected in you methodology?

10. See page 19, para 2, lines 6-9, what exactly did you mean? How long did it take between the time you asked the respondents issues about short term and long term. That did not reflect in your methodology.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Page 21, para 3., line 3, pls how do you mean?

Discretionary Revisions

1. Pls check 3.1.3 and restructure the statement - who is the recipient?

2. See 3.2 subsection 3.1.1 (broad categories) why are these categories regarded as long term? Are there not subject to change even before 3 months regarded as short term?

3. See page 20 para all those results expressed in % appeared repetitive and should be expunged. They should be moved to the result section

4. Need a Table on socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents

5. See Table 1, which of the different disaggregated social groups - spouse partner, family, member, friends are the responses coming from? That will help to know where more attention is needed in terms of awareness creation and other strategies. I Think other Tables should show not only the outcomes whether short or long term but the target groups (family member, spouse partner, etc) where the outcomes are coming from.
Level of interest

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

'I declare that I have no competing interests' below

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:** 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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