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April 24, 2014.
To the Reproductive Health Editorial Team

Object: MS: 7203151861177017- Fertility intentions among HIV positive women aged 18-49 years in Addis Ababa Ethiopia

The authors’ would like to thank the reviewers and editors for their constructive comments. We have given response one by one as per the comments and included in the manuscript.

Reviewer # 1(Mona Loutfy)

Major change:

To childbearing changed to reproductive

Authors’ response: all are changed see

Minor changes

Abstract

• What kind of different health facilities

Authors response: now it is changed to public health facilities (hospitals and health centers) see page 2 line 6 and others are corrected accordingly see methodology the authors response under methodology part

• What kind of document review

Authors response It is patients document review to conform their use of ART, CD4 cell count and other relevant information but to minimize the excess use of wording we deleted document review from abstract and detailed points are described under methodology part see page 2 line 10
• Do not use term “child bearing” replace with “reproductive”

*We would rather use “fertility intention” instead of “reproductive intention” and we agreed with see page 2 under result section line 13. Page 2 under conclusion part line 19*

• Use ART instead of HAART since already used

*Authors response we accept and done accordingly see page 2 under result section line 13-15. Under conclusion part page 2 lines 20 and under key words page 2, line 22, the same revision done to other part of the manuscript*

• Change “in a” sexual relationship

*Authors’ response: Changed to having partner see page 2 under result section line 15*

• Conclusion could be stronger

*Revision was done see page 2 under abstracts sub title conclusion line 19-21*

*A considerable proportion of women reported fertility intention. There was an association between fertility intentions and ART use. It is important for health service providers and policy makers to strengthen the fertility need of HIV positive women along with HIV care so that women may decide freely and responsibly on their fertility issues.*

**Introduction**

• Introduction is very well written and clear but long

*Authors’ response: as far as it is clear, we appreciate if you accept as it is.*
• Change childbearing to “reproductive”

  Author’s response now the childbearing intention changed to reproductive intention see page 3 under introduction section paragraph 3 line 32

• Define PLWH when first used

  Authors’ response it is defined as people living with HIV (PLWH), see page 3 under introduction section paragraph 5 line 39

• Use ART instead of HAART since all are ART now for adult is 3 drugs or more

  Authors’ response: well accepted and corrected see page 3 paragraph 5 line 39
  and 24 also HAART changed to ART see page 4 under introduction paragraph 6-8, line 44,47and line 56 duration of HAART use changed by ART use
  The comment is accepted and corrected for other parts and indicated

**Methods:**

• Methods:
  - It is unclear which health facilities were involved – all?
    Public hospitals and health centers were involved and corrected accordingly see page 5-6, under study design and sampling procedures line 83,84, 83-86
  
  - Analysis is brief compared to rest – how was multivariable regression model factors included + chosen?

  The analysis part is not brief as it starts from page 7 under subtitle of measurement and the analysis subtitle revised see page 9 line 139-142. The pre coded responses were double entered in EPI Info version 3.5.2 software, for checking its consistency then was exported to SPSS for window version 20 for statistical analysis used were percentage, frequency, bivariate and multiple logistic regression analysis. Variables found to be significant at bivariate level, (P< 0.05), were selected and included in to multiple logistic regression models. Then multiple logistic regression analyses model were used to calculate Odds ratio with 95% confidence interval to estimate association and to control the potential confounding variables. Strength and direction of the association
presented using odds ratios relative to the reference category and 95% confidence levels.

The reasons how multivariate regression model included:

Variables found to be significant at bivariate level, \( P < 0.05 \), were selected and included in to multiple logistic regression models. Then multiple logistic regression analyses model were used to calculate Odds ratio with 95% confidence interval to estimate association and to control the potential confounding variables see page 8 line 136-141

Results & Discussion were well written.

Authors’ response: thank you

References:

References: I thought I was asked to review this paper because my paper (Loutfy et al. was used as a guide) as there were similarities but I did not find it. I am not indicating to add as would be a conflict of interest.

Authors’ response: actually we have included in other papers and thank you for the concern, it is valuable paper, we included in our discussion part see page 11 paragraph 1

Figures & Tables
- Table 1 – define CWS at end
  Authors response: The CSWS: it is commercial sex workers and included under table 1 see page 20

- Table 2 – use ART instead of HAART
  Authors response HAART is changed to ART see table 2 rows 3 column 1 and table 3 row 27-29, column 1 page 21

Figures – define ART; Figure 1 not useful
Define ART:

Authors response based on the previous comment to change HAART to ART the definition also indicated accordingly see page 7 under subtitle of measurements
Author's response the comment is accepted and figure 1 now deleted including its see page 9 paragraph 3, line 177-186 and description about fertility intention moved to under subtitle of fertility and clinical characteristics page 9 line 166 and 167. As a result of change on figure 1 we modified title of figure 2 and its description from reproductive to fertility intention see page 9 under result section and table 2 row 1 column 1 and 3 page 21

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being Published
   Revision was done

Reviewer # 2 (samuel olowookere)

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS
None

Minor essential revisions
- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct): Language editing is needed.

   Authors’ response:
   Labels of figures, the figure one is deleted and others are edited
   Wrong use of terms: corrected and edited
   Language edition is done

   References need to follow journals guideline to authors

   Authors’ response: references are edited according the journals guideline to authors