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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (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?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

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

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

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 - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors have responded to the comments but there are some issues to be addressed.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Rewrite "Having no formal education (Adjusted Odds Ratio (AOR) = 0.028, 95% Confidence Interval (CI) = 0.002- 0.394 and p= 0.008) was associated with low retention in HIV care (Table 2)."

as

"The odds of retention in HIV care was very low among women with no formal education (Adjusted Odds Ratio (AOR) = 0.028, 95% Confidence Interval (CI) = 0.002- 0.394 and p= 0.008) than those with formal education (Table 2)."

Figure 2: The title should be: Distribution of numbers of visits missed within three months prior to this study.

Table 2: The 2nd and 3rd columns are too busy unnecessarily. Delete all the "(n=116) (n=16)" within these columns except those in the heading. Also, place a percentage symbol (%) in the column headings and delete all the % sign in the 2 columns.
More importantly, the adjusted odds ratio and the respective confidence interval and the associated p-values for the variables "privacy at the clinics" and "perceived confidentiality" as presented by the authors are statistically impossible. For instance, the aOR for "privacy at the clinic" was reported as 20.38 (10.32-87.31) with p=0.996. Authors, the interval is very large and its reliability is in doubt, it is nonetheless statistically significant since the interval does not contain 1. Therefore the p-value is not plausible. It is either the aOR is wrong and the p-value is correct or vice-versa.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS: nil

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

Yes

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:
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