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Reviewers report:

Research Question
The question was very valid. It is not new but the findings would still translate into care especially in this part of Africa.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1.0 Methods:
1.1 The study design and setting was described in detail.
1.2 For the study population, women who were 15-49 years on ART were eligible for the study. The duration on ART can confound the study finding. If a woman is starting ART, they tend to be more health conscious and would probably use contraceptive as compared to women who have been on ART for more than a year. How did the team control for this bias?
1.3 Shorten the section on sample size determination section to describe the main factors and assumptions considered.
1.4 In the section of data collection and procedures, was fertility desires assessed as a potential confounder? Omit the last sentence.
1.5 The measurement of the contraceptive use is not clear. The authors use the word current. Does that mean that day? Past week? Past month? Past year? This needs to be clearly specified. How did the team control for biases such as social desirability bias?
1.6 For the data entry, processing and analysis section, what factors were included in the multivariate logistic regression model.
1.7 Do write ACIPH in full under the ethical consideration section. The team is encouraged to take written informed consent during subsequent studies as part of good clinical research practice.

2.0 Data reporting and quality:
2.1 It was not clear where Figure 1 of the conceptual framework came into play in the paper. It should have been used in the methods to guide the statistical analysis. The figure also lacks the interaction and contribution of HIV and ART use in the model.
2.2 Tables 1-4 can be merged into table 1 to describe the important variables as shown in the conceptual framework.
2.3 Table 5 can be decongested by removing the column for crude odds ratios. It would be good to add a column for the p-values.

2.4 The results section is too long with no logical flow. The author is advised to use the conceptual framework to guide the presentation of results and thereafter the discussion.

2.5 There was no mention on how the use of barrier mentions versus hormonal mentions affects the main outcomes since barrier methods in addition to preventing pregnancy can also be used to prevent HIV transmission.

3.0 Discussions and Derived Conclusions:
3.1 The discussion section is too long. It needs to keep it short and straight to the point.
3.2 Can summarize the study limitation and recommendations (possible actions) sections under the conclusion.
3.3 Omit the list of abbreviations.

4.0 Writing Skills:
4.1 There were many grammatical and typological errors which made it difficult to read the paper. The authors need to revise the whole paper to correct all the grammar.

Minor Essential Revisions
5.0 Title and Abstract:
5.1 The use of the words “associated factors” in the title needs to be revised.
5.2 The background section of the abstract is long. The target population is not stated in the methods of the abstract. The conclusion section of the abstract needs to be revised to depict the clinical relevance of the study.
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