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Reviewer's report:

I would like to commend the authors on a much improved manuscript. However, there a still a small number of issues that must be addressed.

1) The authors have added a conceptual framework and outline how it connects to the data on the top of page 10. This listing should fit with/mirror the organization of the results section to ensure that evidence is provided for each item in the list in the results section.

2) Are poverty and food insecurity policy level or individual factors? They are experienced at the individual level; if the authors want to make an argument for why these are policy level factors, it needs to be more explicitly stated.

3) Each quote needs contextualization. There are several places where 2 and sometimes 3 quotes are just listed one after the next. This is appropriate in a report, but unless there is text prior to that outlines why these multiple quotes are being listed together, there should be text interpreting each quote before/after it.

4) The section on discordant couple still does not fit/is not properly set up as part of the social support section. The authors do a much better job in the discussion explaining why this is a component of social support, but it needs to be clearer in the shift from the quote at the top of page 19 to the discussion of discordant couples, why this is an issue of social support, and the complexities that are introduced when couples are discordant. How does this experience look different from the way social support is discussed in the rest of the section? To this end, the conclusion of the section says that 'Additionally' discordancy affects adherence, but not in the same ways for men/women, or those who aren't in discordant couples.

5) The results highlight both barriers and facilitators, the set up of the discussion should as well.

6) The discussion section on social support (lines 572-582) should also include the paragraph on the top of pg 25 - this is also about social relationships and the ways that supporting others can benefit/detract from ART adherence. This should highlight the ways that kids and grandkids support adherence.

7) Pg 25, lines 605-610, say that the factors interact with one another - other than presenting the different aspects of each, there really isn't any discussion of HOW these different levels of the socio-ecological model interact with one another. If the authors want to claim this, there
needs to be more evidence presented in the results, or bring out the interaction between levels more explicitly in the discussion.

8) The first sentence of the conclusion (lines 624-626) basically replicates the sentence at the end of the methods section, and the beginning of the discussion. In all places it lists out barriers, but misses the facilitators. It also just feels repetitive. See if there is another way to summarize the key findings that doesn’t repeat this list again.

There are a number of typos that need to be caught - bottom of page 12 in quote; reread lines 328-331 on Page 14 as it is hard to follow; pg 14, line 335 - not sufficient, should be insufficient; pg 20 lines 484-486 treatment not treatments/ is seen to should be is seen visiting/ shunning away not right word choice.

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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