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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions

General comments

1. The authors have done a great job to address a topic of great public health importance and a leading cause of morbidity and mortality in resource limited settings.

2. The paper is well written but critical data is missing from the abstract e.g. setting, results etc. See specific comments below.

3. Limitations and other comments withstanding, this paper adds substantial new knowledge in a field of great public health importance. These comments are .

Specific comments

1. Title: Could simply be stated as “Are women with complications of an incomplete abortion at a higher risk of HIV infection than women without complications?” or “Are women with complications of an incomplete abortion more likely to be HIV infected than women without complications?”

Abstract

2. Page 2/28- Seems to be a big statement. I am not sure it is supported by existing evidence or justified from the literature review.

3. Page 2/44; the results sections should present some data on how many women were in each group. How many were in the different status (Positive, negative and status unknown). The abstract should be able to stand on its own and present relevant data.

4. Page 3/59- In some ways the conclusion is written like the results section. Please use similar language to that used in the main paper. Avoiding words such as “three folds higher odds

Background

4. Page 5/104-114. Consider adding some information on access to testing for women seeking health care especially as many resource limited settings are implementing provider initiated testing and counselling. Please mention whether this is a gap in Uganda or not.

Methods

5. Page 6/125: Referring to the study design as “Cross sectional case control
analysis of …” is confusing. Consider re-stating/rewording as. “We analyzed secondary data from a study assessing the economic impact of ……[15]. We compared x to y.

Results
Nicely written no comments
Discussion and conclusion
Well written, no additional comments

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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