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Reviewer’s report:

Fertility desire and associated factors among people living with HIV attending antiretroviral therapy clinic in Fitche Hospital, north shoa zone, Oromiya, Ethiopia, 2013

Overall, this is potentially an interesting study that documents fertility desires and their predictors among PLHIV in care. The study has good findings but the presentation of the paper makes it difficult to read and to focus on the key findings, which are buried into very detailed narratives. The paper is too wordy and the language requires major adjustments (editorial support).

Major revisions

Abstract
• Generally, the abstract does not present a good summary of the key findings and conclusions
• Too long: much of the text in green under the methods and conclusion could be removed. The green text under conclusions is a repeat of the results rather than a conclusion.

Background
• The background is too long and repetitive and some of the text is not so relevant to the subject. For example, the first paragraph could be deleted and/or replaced by literature that is more relevant to fertility among PLHIV.
• The literature on page 2 could be reduced to less than half since many of the concepts are repeated. The last paragraph under the background section (top of page 3) could also be reduced to <half; the first half of the paragraph is repeated

Methodology
• Methods are appropriate but not well described
• The variables (outcome and predictor variables) are not well described and several are not defined at all. For example, fertility desires (the outcome variable) is not defined. Several other variables are also not defined (e.g. sexually active, condom use, dual contraceptive use) and are thus difficult to understand when they appear under the results section. Related to this, the determination of knowledgeable/not knowledgeable in relation to PMTCT (page 6) is not clear. What were the respondents asked to determine knowledge?
• Respondents were selected randomly from a list of potentially eligible (by age) created by the researchers, from individuals in the clinic. It is not clear how the selected individuals were approached after the random selection from this list. Were they called and asked to come to the facility for interviews, who called them and through what channel (telephone, home visit)? Were all selected individuals eventually reached?

• Qualitative interview respondents were selected purposively but the criteria for this purposive selection is not described

Results
• There is a lot of detailed narratives that could have been presented in tables. For example the description of socio-demographic characteristics is presented entirely as narratives (very long) and there is no table showing these characteristics; this makes it difficult to appreciate the population presented. Yet, the results include several small tables that could have been merged into one table; e.g. table 1, table 2, and others thereafter. The pie chart at the end of the manuscript, which bears no title, is a repeat of the data already presented.

• The results section includes only one reference to and quotation from qualitative interviews, yet, several qualitative interviews were conducted. Instead a lot of the qualitative findings are presented under the discussion section. These findings should be pulled out of the discussion section and presented under results

• Page 7, describing socio-demographic characteristics could be reduced to half, if an appropriate table showing socio-demographic and other potential predictor variables is added

• Table 1 on page 8 refers to contraceptive use (in its title) but no contraceptive data is included in the table. The table also has no preceding summary to introduce the reader to its content; this applies to other tables as well.

• Table 2 is very short and could have been expanded to include other data, for example the detailed narratives on fertility desires, immediately under the table

• Table 3 (health and HIV treatment status) could have been presented earlier as part of the description of this population. Both table 3 and 4 have no preceding text to introduce a reader to the content. This also applies to Table 5.

Discussion
• The discussion requires major adjustments to focus the reader to the key findings and implications of the findings.

• The authors present a lot of relevant literature but the contribution of this study to addressing the defined gaps (under the background section) is not clearly described

• The discussion includes a lot of new findings (qualitative data) that were not presented under the results section

• Suggestions: Start with a summary of the study aim and key findings; explain the findings and the implications of the findings, then highlight the limitations of
the study, before the conclusion and recommendations.

Minor Essential Revisions

• Abstract: There is so much emphasis on Ethiopia, which limits the utility of the findings; these findings are applicable to other high prevalence settings with similar fertility patterns (most countries in sub-Saharan Africa).
• Background: The aims of the study could also be reformatted and presented in a more concise manner
• Methodology: This section has too many subheadings (page 4 and page 5) that could be collapsed and presented in a more concise manner
• Results: The text before table 5, on page 12 could have been presented under methodology; should be replaced with a summary of the findings presented in Table 5

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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