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1. Does it address an important or timely issue? Is it original?

Yes

2. Is it well reasoned with substantive findings?

Yes.

3. Is the standard of writing acceptable?

Yes

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. NONE. This is a well-argued article overall.

Minor Essential Revisions

2. A little more explication of the method is needed. How many or what proportion of those interviewed verified or adjusted the interviewer notes for accuracy. Approximately how long were the interviews?

3. Although the training of the interviewers was thorough, nothing is said about how the quality of the interviews and the field notes was maintained during the period of the field work. It would be important to note how quality was maintained during fieldwork other than just the statement that the interviewers were supervised.

4. Translation needs to be addressed. It would be really helpful to have the original quotes in French and the English translation. Perhaps this could be done as an additional file. Using the quotes in the article would be satisfactory - as readers can then see the fidelity of the translation.
5. In the paragraph beginning with "Training is generally considered a necessary part...." A reference for the quantitative research mentioned in the second sentence. In the third sentence, the word triangulation does not make sense here without further explanation. I would suggest replacing the word.

Discretionary Revisions

The keyword, Option B, by itself does not make sense. It would make more sense if the keyword was WHO HIV Option B (if that indeed works as a keyword).
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