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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?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with 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?
N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

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: This study is well conceptualised and well written and contributes to the literature on the experience of ART amongst older populations from the perspective of those benefiting from the largest ART provider in Kenya. The authors describe the background programme well including the citing of both its benefits and those areas where the care it provides may not be optimal such as separate clinic days for other chronic conditions such as diabetes and cancer. The paper is a descriptive one based on qualitative methods and provides much in-depth empirical data to support its arguments. The authors appear to have analysed the data well, citing participant quotes that clearly reflect the summative arguments they make. The
discussion provides a good review of the findings, situating these in the context of other work. There are two main areas that could have been developed further throughout the paper. The first is that there is no comparative perspective on the experiences of older people and how these compare with experiences of younger people engaging in care. In fact many of the issues raised are similar to those experienced by younger care seekers, except most prominently the experience of multiple different clinic visits necessitated by other conditions associated with ageing. The second is that the socio-ecological framing described at the beginning of the paper is not pursued or used in the results section or indeed discussed explicitly within the discussion. It would have been useful to understand whether this framework facilitated the research and how it was used to guide the analysis and interpretation, beyond just a way of framing layers in research topics. Despite these two areas, the paper is well written and makes clear and relevant points that are pursued to the end in the conclusions section.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
Other than the suggestions made above there are no substantive revisions the authors need to make

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
See above

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.

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.

Yes

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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/](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