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Reviewer's report:

Overall, this was a well-written paper and analyzed the discourse around HST in a different way than what has been in the literature. The authors bring forth various points of views around HST which will be important for policy makers, researchers, and program implementers to keep in mind.

Page 1, Lines 40-44: This sentence is extremely vague:

* Why do the authors say "...HST has never been widely endorsed in the field of HIV..."? What about the 2016 WHO self-testing guidelines?


* This "lack of compelling evidence" also needs clarification. What is lacking? Evidence of acceptability (there plenty of that)? Evidence of actual uptake? Evidence of effectiveness in reaching the first 90 (i.e. in reaching undiagnosed HIV infected persons)? Please clarify the type of evidence that is missing.

Page 5, Lines 24-34: Agree that people feel HST should not be seen as substitute for lab test and that confirmatory testing is needed. It would be good to include a line on the reasoning behind why they believe HST should be followed by confirmatory testing.

Pages 5-6 in Target - Market argument: This is an important point revealed that those who would most likely use were not necessarily the target group. However, were there any findings from the "Target" argument of side of how or what strategies should be used to target so that the target people can access it?

Page 9, Line 30-31: You need to first explain what you mean by 'exceptionalism' and 'normalization'. The paper at times gets a bit esoteric and academic, and this is an example of it. The authors need to explain concepts and ideas in a more simple and practical way.
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