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Reviewer’s report:

Thank-you for the opportunity to review this very good paper which looks at an important issue of operational research. I do agree with the authors' conclusions regarding integrating syphilis testing into HIV antenatal clinics. I have some minor issues and some discretionary comments.

Discretionary revisions:

1. Is it worthwhile mentioning that there is now no Yaws in Uganda? This would help to reinforce the fact that positive treponemal serology is almost certainly due to syphilis.

2. Which treponemal antibody test (besides the RPR) was performed? Are results available? It is possible that some of the low-level positive RPR results are due to biological false-positives.

3. What was the mean RPR result? Given that the authors state that the women with a positive RPR result had no side-effects from treatment with benzathine penicillin, I am assuming that no Jarisch-Herxheimer reactions occurred. If so, it is likely the positive RPR results represented latent syphilis or past treated (perhaps inadvertently) syphilis. If this is so, then the risk of congenital/neonatal syphilis would be significantly lowered if the women were not treated for their RPR reactivity.

4. Can the authors confirm that even for latent syphilis or syphilis of uncertain duration, the recommended treatment in Uganda is only one dose of benzathine penicillin? In many other countries a course of 3 injections, one week apart, is the usual treatment.

5. With regards to the male partners of these women not attending the authors’ clinic, is it possible they may have sought treatment elsewhere, or is that very unlikely?

Minor revision:

1. Under Prevalence and factors associated with a positive RPR...(paragraph 2, line 2) - "did" should be "were"

2. Under Discussion - (paragraph 3) - the sentence commencing "Low partner notification in Mozambican..." does not make sense to me.
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