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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

No - there are issues with the statistics in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: A very innovative study to help programmers identify why ARTs are not completed and how HIV positive mothers can be retained and full ART uptake can be sustained in HIV management. The Objectives were clear and good approaches used.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Abstracts

Methods: Change "Questionnaires were administered and four focus group discussions were held. We used descriptive statistics to understand characteristics of mothers and multivariable logistic regression model for quantitative data. Thematic analysis was used to analyze qualitative data. Analyses were performed using SPSS version 23."

To

"Questionnaires were administered and four focus group discussions were held. We used descriptive statistics to understand characteristics of mothers and multivariable logistic regression model for quantitative data with the aid of SPSS version 23. Thematic analysis was used to analyze qualitative data."

Result: Delete "A total of 132 HIV positive pregnant and breastfeeding mothers were included in the study." It is already stated in the methods.
Change "Majority 47 (35.6%)" to "About a third (35.6%)"

Page 3 Line 32-33: Majority/More than half of all the women or those retained?

Page 3 L33-34: 26 (IQR 23). IQR of 23 with median of 26 is very suspicious. What was the minimum and maximum age?

Page 3 L40-41: lack of disclosure of HIV status" ……To who?

Page 6: How was the 132 selected from the 200?

How many of retained and non-retained women were selected? Were these numbers predetermined? Yes or No..Justify which ever applies

Page 6 Line 60: Authors should talk about how and why they selected the independent variables and also endeavour to state how AOR variables were selected.

Page 7: Who are "active and none-active HIV positive mothers"? Do they correspond to retained and non-retained? If yes, stick to a term. If no, define.

Results

Move and incorporate the first five lines into your methodology. Avoid duplications in the methods section. They don't belong to results.

Page 7 Line 53: Majority, 116 (87.9%) of the HIV positive mothers were retained in HIV care," This statement can only be meaningful if the 132 were selected in a random manner from the register in the health centres. That's why you should clarify your sampling procedures as requested earlier.

Table 1 and Table 2: While the ORs of individual levels and site levels can be computed and stated separately as it is, the AOR can not be analysed separately. Authors should put all variables significant, at say 20% or 10% in a single multiple logistic regression model to determine the AORs.

Authors should emphasize the policy implication of their findings.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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