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Reviewer’s comments:

Can HIV testing campaigns expand access and protect individual rights? Provide and client perspective on the ethics of campaigns in Burkina Faso.

I thank the authors for a well written and informative article in the era of increasing HIV testing as a strategy to reduce HIV prevalence. There are few comments the authors should address before publishing the article as outlined per section.

The title is precise, concise, and reflects content of work. The title also stimulates interest of readers to read article. Well formulated!!!

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

1. The authors do not document results from observations yet it was mentioned as one the data collection methods. Where are the results from observations? Please insert results from observations.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

2. The authors have cited recent literature review and provide adequate background information to orientate the reader. However, it is important to always clarify the condition or disease the authors refer to when mentioning prevalence for example on line 79 it is only documented high and low prevalence. It is better to write high and low HIV prevalence.

3. The author should avoid use long sentences, it makes hard for the reader to comprehend what they are trying to communicate. For example; lines 94 to 98 has over 60 words this is not acceptable in scientific writing, please shorten the sentence, by breaking it into 2 or more clear sentences.

4. Avoid use of abbreviations such as i.e on line 119.

Methods

5. The authors should clearly describe the setting in which the interviews during
data collection were conducted. It is very important to understand how the issue of privacy and confidentiality was handled by the researchers. This is important as the paper is addressing ethical issues and patients rights.

6. The authors mention that clearance for the research was sought from the WHO Ethics committee and Ethics committee of Burkina Faso without documenting the clearance number. Please can you insert the Ethical Clarence number

Results

7. When inserting the particulars of the person who made comments during the interview it would be better to add the age and sex of the individuals. For example line 192 it would be better to say this was mentioned by “a 25-year old man who tested during campaign”. This would guide the reader to understand the perceptions from different sex and age groups. This should be modified for all results

8. “To avoid sending away clients without testing” the authors mention that they do not use triaging for managing crowding in testing centres. However the authors do not explain how the some client that are given extra appointment after the campaigns to be offered pre-test that is long enough are selected without triaging!! Please explain how such clients that are given extra appointments are selected without triaging. Lines 310-313

9. Line 315-316. Please describe in detail places that ensure privacy in open setting. Do providers use boards or curtains during campaigns? What type of privacy do providers address? Is it visual or audio or both? Please clarify

10. Lines 323-324: How do providers help clients hide emotions? Describe in detail

11. Lines 367-374: This section should be under discussion not under results

Discussion

12. The authors clearly discuss how their results relate to other study findings. However, on line 398 , the authors must revise the insertion of citations to be included in same brackets

13. Most of the researches or if not all, conducted have limitations. Can the authors list some limitations encountered and explain how these might have affected the results.

Conclusion

14. The conclusions reflect major findings of the study but the authors do not explain the extent to which the results are generalized to a wider population. The authors should explain generalizibility of the findings.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests: None