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Reviewer's report:

Please consider all comments as minor essential revisions, except where stated as discretionary revisions in parenthesis following the comment.

1. Goal: Stated differently in the abstract (lines 43, 44) and in the main text (lines 117-119). Please be consistent.

2. Abstract:
2.1 Line 51, 52 – Multivariate logistic regression were performed to compare which groups?

3. Main text
3.1 Background:
3.1.1 Lines 80 – 81: ...reduces the risk of HIV transmission to <5% (in whom?). (Discretionary revisions)
In the background or in the study population section, consider providing some basic information on health care facilities in this area of 385 villages: number of facilities with ANC and delivery services.

3.2 Methods:
3.2.1 Line 141: It might help to state that the 523 randomly selected women were HIV negative. (Discretionary revisions)

3.2.2 Data analysis: Please state clearly which groups were compared. Not having that framework provided in the analysis, it was confusing reading the results.
3.2.3 Line 160 – Strictly speaking, there were no rates calculated. Please re-word. (Discretionary revisions)

3.3 Results:
3.3.1 Lines 176-177: Might be more clear to say that you enrolled 216 HIV positive and 436 HIV negative women in this study, rather than giving the total and n (%) of HIV positive, since the two groups were sampled independently.
3.3.2 In the methods, you state that you had a list of 275 HIV positive and 523 HIV negative women. You enrolled 216 and 436 of HIV positive and negative women, respectively. Did the others not consent or not located? Please include this in text if possible. (Discretionary revisions)
3.3.3 Characteristics of study population (and Table 1): it would be informative to see the baseline characteristics of the HIV-negative women too.

3.3.4 Line 204 (and Table 2): Gestation at 1st ANC visit is indented under Prior pregnancy loss in Table 2. Please correct this (and same with ANC attendance in Table 2).

3.3.5 Line 224: Regarding distance from health facility – if you have access to the geo-location of health facilities in this community, can you calculate distance for each of your study participant and incorporate that into your analysis? (Discretionary revisions)

3.3.6 Line 233: Based on numbers in line 176, are there not 436 HIV-negative women? In line 233 and in table 3, you say 378.

3.4 Discussion:
Line 267: I understand what you are saying here but it comes across as though HIV-infected women do not have any concerns that might prevent them from accessing facility delivery. What you are trying to say is they do have concerns; their concerns are no different from non-HIV infected women. Please consider re-wording. (Discretionary revisions)

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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