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Reviewer's report:

Major revisions;
1. Abstract:
   (i) It is not clear how the suggested recommendations differ from the current combination HIV Prevention strategies (CHP) being implemented as a national response for the key populations in Uganda. It is also not clear how the recommended routine counselling about the effectiveness of services against HIV will differ from what is already being done in these fishing communities by the Rakia Health Sciences Program. It is better to suggest ways on how to improve on what is already being done than suggesting new approaches altogether/dressing them differently.
   
   Also, the recommendations don't seem to be supported by the findings especially when it mentions "migrants". This is because this study participants were selected based on prior participation other studies eg the Rakai Community Cohort Study (RCCS). These oversights also do flow into the end of the discussion section under the "conclusions/recommendation.

Background
1. The current study aim need to be revised to thyme well with the stated research gap. As it now, it seems to give less recognition to the achievements/successes of the current prevention efforts. It ought to be stated in a way that would make the findings from this study to contribute to better CHP implantation, success or adjustment. Evaluation studies about CHP could be helpful here.

2. I find the background section quite brief.

Methods

Study design
1. What study design did the current study take? This was a cross sectional study. This is implied but not stated.

Study area and population
1. The study title only mentions "Kasensero" fishing community. Later on in the methods section, one realizes that there were other fishing communities too. These are not mentioned. The reader is left wondering what proportion of the
study population and sample do they contribute. Also it not stated whether the population in these other fishing communities have similar characteristics save for nationality.

2. Do these study findings refer only to Kasensero or even other five "smaller" fishing communities?

3. What was the time lag between the RCCS census and this study? If these did not run 2 weeks apart, there is more likelihood that the study participants were misclassified because of sero-conversion. Or the study tested the participants for HIV? if so state it.

Results
1. Expand on all the results sub sections. There is less explanation of what was found with the hope that the quotes would do the missing parts.

2. Line 104, How were the ART and circumcision services provided/organized at these facilities?

3. Under the frequent protected sex, line 146, did this apply to all respondents.

5. What did respondents mean by "irresponsible parenting"? Let the quotes be an additional explanation to yours.

6. How do you account for no condom use among children still under their parents' care? Do the boy children also get into sex activities after being sent away to stay with friends when they parents are having sex?

7. Lines 184-6, go ahead and explain how sex trade is organized. How does the sex trade organization exposes some women to HIV infection?

8. How was old/young defined? What did the participants define cross generational sex?

Discussion
1. Line, 208-210, there are no results to support this. Mentioning the different components of CHP and how HIV services are organized in the fishing communities could helpful here.

2. Lines 214-217 seem to contradict what was stated in lines 209-212.

3. Lines 231-235 is double edged. on one hand it promotes what the authors stated. On the other, it promotes a sense of control and abstinence though is likely to be short lived.

4. Lines 245 explains none condom use among women but among men. What explains low condom use among men?

5. Lines, 261-5, more justification why the authors had to show how sex trade was organized in these fishing communities.

Reccomndations
1. See comments on abstract.

Background
1. Minor revisions
(i). Line 4-5, comparing the HIV incidence in this fishing community to other fishing communities/none fishing communities would further give the reader a picture how big the HIV transmissions have failed to fall/decline in Kasensero fishing community.

(ii). Line 8-9, provides an opportunity to inform the reader what constitutes the CHP strategies. This would further provide a foundation for introducing a conceptual framework.

Methods
1. The current study drew participants from the RCCS. One would expect the RCCS descriptions to come before this study specific ones.
2. How much time did each of the in-depth interviews last?
3. How was data managed, coded and who were involved in the analysis?

Results
1. Consider rephrasing the first results themes to: "service availability driven HIV acquisition"
2. Lines 103-4, was this similar to 15-19 group?
3. Lines 136-7, did everyone report multiple partners? which people reported this? See comments major revision under results.
4. Line 147, insert cost/money after the word more.
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