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Reviewer’s report:

Thanks for the opportunity to review this solid manuscript on risk of HIV transmission and survival. In particular, the study objective is a very important one that was clearly conveyed. Generally, it was well done.

The English was quite good, but there are still some sections that should be reviewed by a native speaker for clarity. Here are some examples: line 23 on page 4, missing "the" at line 10 on page 5; Try "Live born infants of HIV-infected women" at line 49 on page 6. Also, some typos, e.g. "scare" in abstract, "teens" on page 6.

There are too many significant figures in some of the results. One sig. fig. should suffice for most of these values.

A figure that unites all the findings in one place would be useful, something along the lines of a study participant flow diagram, but that includes information not only about loss to follow-up/missing information but also incidence of infection and death by feeding modality.

Please comment on the implications that the large number of cases of missing infant feeding data may have for interpretation of data.

What % of women delivered in a facility? (That could also go in the figure I proposed above.)

In our review of infant feeding, (Current knowledge and future research on infant feeding in the context of HIV: Basic, clinical, behavioral, and programmatic perspectives) Figure 2 reviews key timepoints in the cascade. The discussion could perhaps focus more on which of these clinical settings can address and how they can better do so.

Are the women who provided infant feeding modality systematically different than other women? Why or why not? How so?

How confident are you that infant feeding modality was correctly reported? Do you think infections among ERF were acquired prenatally?

Please provide the infant feeding assessment instrument as online supplementary material.
The discussion should address the fact that replacement feeding is no longer recommended in low resource settings.

It isn't clear what is meant by lines 34-37 on page 11.

The tables should be tidied up a bit, with sample size included, and more complete and typo-free captions.

Lastly, the discussion could better address the stated objective, which was to discuss generalizability to PMTCT high-priority countries.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
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