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A well conceived and executed study on health care providers' perspectives on pregnancy and parenting in HIV positive individuals in South Africa.

A few comments to enhance clarity:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? YES
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? YES
3. Are the data sound? YES
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? YES
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? YES
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? YES
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? YES
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? YES
9. Is the writing acceptable? YES

1. Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Introduction

Update the statistics of those on ART. Africa appears to be a global leader now despite a late start. Figures up to 2012 available from: Access to Antiretroviral therapy in Africa-Status report on progress towards the 2015 targets.

Findings

It would have been interesting to explore the attitude of these health workers regarding pregnancy, childbirth and adoption specifically seroconcordant, serodiscordant and polygynous unions. I don't know how common the last type of union is in South Africa.
Discussion
Discuss the likely effects of Health care worker’s gender, HIV status, marital status and cultural background on their views about pregnancy, childbirth and adoption among HIV positive people.
Also, discuss how the background of the researchers or their assistants (HCWs, involvement in ART treatment etc) affect the synthesis of the views and opinions expressed by the health workers?
The recommendations should be clearly directed at those that can take action-policy makers, health service managers, health workers etc.
Overall- a good paper
2. Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Abstract
Results
Replace the first ‘limited’ with ‘inadequate’ knowledge. This is to avoid using limited twice in the same sentence
3. Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
Why was there a time lag between the interviews and its reporting (2007-2008 and 2014)? HIV is a rapidly evolving field and data could soon be out of date!

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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