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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript examines an interesting topic, namely the use of community mobilization to improve maternal health among HIV-positive women.

However, there are a number of challenges in the manuscript in its current form.

Abstract

1. Should read "the data were digitally recorded."

2. The term "portfolio assets" is not used in public health research. Please explain it.

3. Why is "unrecognized…" in quotations? Did a participant say this or are the authors trying to coin a new concept? Please double-check.

Introduction

4. The paragraph on page 2, lines 40-49 can be moved to Discussion.

Theoretical Framework

5. Nhamo and Campbell need to also be cited in the normal journal style (eg., [7])

6. The theoretical framework employed seems to arise from a program document (citation [9]). This is an inappropriate source of a theoretical framework for an academic paper. Consider either finding a framework that emerges from the peer-reviewed literature, OR
using this paper to construct the framework. In other words, you could use these qualitative data to unpack the elements of community mobilization.

Methods

7. The manuscript needs a good copy edit. For example, Should remove page 3, line 22 "Other than that…" Should be "informed consent was sought." On page 9, line 23, the use of "eulogized" is incorrect. On page 10, line 57, use of "improbity" is incorrect.

8. Please spell out CIDRZ and PPAZ in the first instance

9. Can remove page 4, line 56-59 as this is redundant

10. On page 5, line 9, also explain that participants were tracked through the discussion using numbers.

11. Explain how confidentiality was maintained or worked towards in the FGDs.

12. Please add one or two sentences about the position of the authors. They seem to be program staff of Zambulance, so how did this particular set of interests frame how the data were collected and analyzed?

Results

13. I cannot find Table 1 in the submission

14. Be careful throughout the Results that if you present two quotes in a row, these support the same idea. For example, on page 6 lines 39-48, these two quotes present two separate constructs.

15. On page 6, line 56 onwards, please restate in simpler language.

16. Use the term "stigma" instead of "clichés".
Discussion

17. On page 10, line 27, starting with "The mainstream narrative…” deserves its own paragraph.

18. On page 10, line 51, the authors talk about how participants "collectively challenge common obstacles…", but this is the first time collective action is addressed. Be sure it's included in Results.

19. The Discussion is far too long. Can remove page 11, lines 7-19 and lines 40-52.

20. On page 11, line 29, there are several examples of how TBAs instrumentally support women, but these examples need to first be highlighted in the Results.

21. Please link to other TBA literature, for example from Kenya, to demonstrate how your findings further the field.

22. The limitation of non-generalizability is inappropriate for qualitative research, which does not aim to be generalizable. Think instead of the limitations associated with how you recruited participants, how information was elicited, how they may have viewed you as data collectors, how your own biases informed the research. This section is very important and requires more work.

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.
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