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Evaluation on the Manuscript titled "Awareness and knowledge of antenatal care attending women on mother-to-child transmission of HIV and its timing in Southern Ethiopia. By Anteneh Asefa

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

The question posed is not new and impressive. The study also has programmatic and implication for the district and the region. The question posed by the authors is also well defined and well presented. The authors have made clarified the operation-definition of the variables; what the authors wanted to measure is also clear. This is what is lacking in most other researches. Knowledge and awareness are clearly defined and presented to the reader.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

The method is appropriate and well described at the appropriate place with details.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

Yes. Very well controlled and consistent throughout the document both in the narrative and the tables.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

The manuscript adheres to most standards for articles; including consistency between different sections of the manuscript.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

- The discussion should be supported by recent data.
- The discussion should try to support with the region specific (Southern Nations and Nationalities) findings of the recent Ethiopian Demographic and Health Survey (2012);
- Better to use the recent Spectrum estimate for HIV.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
The abstract appropriately summarizes the manuscript and accurately presents the major findings and the conclusion.

7. Is the writing acceptable?

The manuscript doesn’t have any serious flaw. The writing is acceptable provided that the above comments (particularly number six above) is considered. My general comment about the manuscript is "Discretionary Revision".

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable