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Reviewer's report:

1. The authors have described the study context within the Background, rather than in Methods.

2. Page 11, lines 17-25: a simple sticker identifying the study, on the medical records may have been easier than cross-checking all the data in the form to ensure that the patient is a study participant.

3. Page 12, line 31: is the confirmatory test random, or routine?

4. Collection of nevirapine by the mother is a secondary outcome. Is nevirapine not administered (or offered) routinely to babies of mothers living with HIV, who deliver in hospitals? If this is so, as expected, it would be superfluous to measure this outcome separately, after primarily measuring facility delivery.

5. It is unclear why information (for comparison in Table 2) was not obtained from the control group. These data would not require an intervention, as they would be available in the medical records, and would have further shown that the randomization resulted in an evenly-matched distribution of participants in either group.

6. Figures 2 and 3 have the same heading. Please amend.

7. The concept is laudable, though like the authors, I noticed that the improvement in uptake of facilities with CCT was modest. However, in a real-life (non-research situation, how do the authors suggest that a capital-intensive venture like this be funded and sustained?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Yes
**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests
I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal