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Reviewer's report:

The authors are to be congratulated on a well written paper of importance. There are a few areas wherein some editing of text is required and the Methods section needs more detail, especially regarding whether any coding was done and the analytical framework used, but overall, the paper is very useful addition to the field and was a pleasure to read.

Specific revisions:

Abstract L 35 the explanation of the cohort is confusing, as there is obviously a larger study and then the one involving only teenagers. Revise wording to reflect this. i.e "purposively selected to include teenagers, HIV positive, and working pregnant women" is confusing where this is a larger cohort, from which the study sample is drawn

Abstract L 42 "...mothers were not involved" revise to "mothers did not appear from our study to be much involved" or similarly tone down the wording. you don't know that the mothers weren't at all involved.

Abstract L 49 "mothers have" should be "mothers had"

Background define teenage pregnancy at the start (age band considered teenage pregnancy)

Methods: this section needs the most work and must be improved to be ready for publication

L 123-124 Revise this wording significantly as it is very confusing: "area had slightly low rate of teenage pregnancy" does this mean lower than the 14% mentioned earlier?

L 129 this needs a lot more detail on sampling and purposive design. explain what you mean by purposive, to select what characteristics?? what is the theoretical basis for sampling, saturation??
L 156-157 it is not immediately understandable why you chose framework analysis rather than a more typical qualitative paradigm and it seems reductionist. Can you give more detail or other examples of similar work that used framework analysis to bolster this position?

L 162 comparative analysis comparing what to what? Was coding done? Were themes sought? This all needs much more detail or else will not stand on its own.

L 163 saturation is usually used in reference to sampling, so not clear how you are using this in analysis. What do you mean by saturation in analysis. Is that when you decided it was a theme?

Themes are mentioned in Results but not in Methods, which is a problem.

Discussion:

L 369 and subsequent: Do not write "Devito' study" but rather "Devito and colleagues found..." or similar phrasing.

L 371 remove 90% as it is meaningless in such a small number. Explain rural and urban are what you mean by both settings.

L 379 see comment for L 369.

L 388 refers to plural studies and authors but only one is cited. Either add authors or revise text.

L 417 mention of Alive and Thrive seems quite random. Better to cite various nutrition programs.
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