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Reviewer's report:

Role of HIV in the desire of procreation and motherhood in women living with HIV in Spain: a qualitative approach

Thank you for the opportunity to review your manuscript on this vital subject. Understanding the ways that HIV influences women's views of motherhood is an important topic. However, I am uncertain that this article, as it currently stands, makes significant contributions to the literature. It may be possible to more clearly articulate the gap that is being addressed by the authors. It may be better suited for a regional or more narrowly focused venue.

Abstract:

More information about the methods in the abstract would be helpful. Were interviews recorded and transcribed? It does not appear that the authors used grounded theory as they applied an a priori theoretical framework. Grounded theory is based upon the premise that meaning emerges from the data. Data are plural.

Introduction:

The topic of HIV and motherhood has been studied extensively. Can the authors include some of the literature that notes the positive aspects of motherhood for women living with HIV? As it stands the introduction is entirely focused on barriers and fears.

Also, please more clearly articulate your gap or question. Is there little research on women in Spain? Is the approach you're taking unique?

Methods:

Below are some questions designed to further strengthen the methods section.
* It would be helpful to know how many were approached? How many agreed to participate?

* Much more detail is needed on the kinds of questions asked as I found the theoretical framework somewhat confusing. Were participants asked about their changes in speech pre-post HIV? How did aspirational elements shape the questions? I doubt that women frequently think about their "social identity." What is the etiology of this framework? Please cite.

* Please provide more detail about data analysis. Grounded theory is mentioned in the abstract and not addressed in the methods section. Did researchers come to consensus about codes?

Results:

* It would be helpful to know mean years since diagnosis.

* Results are typically written in past tense. I found this section rich with information, but difficult to follow at times.

* Please consider starting each section with a paragraph that frames the primary findings.

* The application of the "maternity ideal" is intriguing. Was this a finding that emerged from the results or was this part of the original framework? Did women actually talk about their aspirational ideals of motherhood?

* The third dimension "decision on motherhood" assumes that women make an intentional and conscious decision about procreating. It's been well documented that women living with HIV have high rates of unintentional pregnancies and relatively low rates of contraceptive use. In that context, decisions on motherhood would occur after pregnancy and not before.

* Page 8 lines 25-29 note that the idea of motherhood is "more related to a notion specific to the society in which these women life….so no changes happen after HIV diagnosis." I find this somewhat confusing since it would appear ideal concepts of motherhood were brought into sharper focus following their diagnosis.

* Page 9 line 4: "Women found it complex to verbalize….arguments in favor of procreations were initially unclear." Unclear to whom? Or was it the women had difficulty articulating reasons in support for procreation.

* Consider organizing the barriers section more tightly. Again, an introductory paragraph framing the findings would help.
* Page 10 line 31: "HIV is not consciously considered an obstacle to motherhood…” How would the researchers know this? And this seems to be contradicted by earlier sections focused on barriers.

* Page 10 line 55: "Some foreign women demonstrate their religious belief.." Was this only true for non-Spanish women?

* Consider using the term "intentional" motherhood, rather than "conscious motherhood." The findings related to the use of assisted reproductive technology was quite fascinating. In fact, this is the strongest set of findings and the most unique as much of the previous results have been found in other studies. Their struggles with conception might be the most significant findings.

Discussion

Please either indent paragraphs or use a space between paragraphs. It appears to be a 2.5 page single paragraph.

The discussion makes linkages between study findings and existing literature. It would be helpful to have a more explicit implications for women with HIV in Spain as that appears to be the most significant aspect of the authors' gap or question.

Best of luck with your work!
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