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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revisions

1. This is a facility based cross sectional study designed to assess the level of demand and factors associated with utilization of LACM. The study of significant importance as it will contribute to primary prevention of MTCT and to date not enough research has been done on contraceptive use among HIV positive women.

2. In the last paragraph of the background, the authors state “greater than 99% protection..” The authors should provide a reference for this statistic and also should remove the brackets from this sentence. The brackets make the sentence appear not important yet it carries an important statistic.

3. The statement “They are very safe..” should be revised as it sounds like an advertisement and also a reference for the comparisons should be provided.

4. The study was conducted among married women only; however HIV positive women in their reproductive age, regardless of their marital status are in need of contraceptive methods. The authors should explain why this study left out women of reproductive age. Secondly, what is the definition of ‘married’? Is this ever married? Did the study exclude divorced women? How about single mothers? Exclusion of all these women grossly restricts the external validity of this study and this is a major weakness of this study.

5. How did the author determine the number of women to select from the four health facilities? Was this based on the number of women at each site? What was the total population of eligible participants at the 4 health facilities from which this sample was drawn?

6. Systematic and random sampling processes are different sampling procedures. A combination of the two methods is very unusual. The authors should explain how they manage to combine these two procedures.

7. The authors describe the results in the tables but do not refer the reader to the appropriate tables in the narrative of the results.

8. How did the authors measure “myths heard”? They need to be more specific regarding what these myths were.
9. The manuscript presents interesting findings but many come as no surprise as these are also the traditional findings in the general population and among HIV negative persons. The authors left out important factors such as HIV sero-discordance, disclosure of HIV infection to partner and partner support. How well are the Reproductive Health services integrated into the ART services at the four clinics? Was utilization the same at the four clinics? This is not sufficiently explored in the data.

10. Majority of references are of studies done in Ethiopia and yet studies on contraceptive utilization among HIV have been done in several countries globally. The authors should be aware that this research should appeal to readers from a wider geographical region beyond Ethiopia and this should be reflected in their geographical scope of reference. I would recommend more recent references such as:

• Nieves CI, Kaida A et al The influence of partnership on contraceptive use among HIV-infected women accessing antiretroviral therapy in rural Uganda. Contraception 2015 May 13

• Laryea DO, Amoako YA et al Contraceptive use and unmet need for family planning among HIV positive women on antiretroviral therapy in Kumasi, Ghana. BMC Womens Health 2014 Oct 11


11. The authors state that one weakness of this study might be social desirability bias but do not explain how this social desirability bias arises.

12. The authors should enrich the discussion with references from outside Ethiopia and also covering aspects like partner involvement.

13. The recommendations on IEC are not supported by the data. They need to be revised, toned down.

14. This manuscript requires extensive grammatical revision. I advise the authors to engage the services of a professional writer to correct the several errors in the manuscript.

Minor essential revisions

1. In paragraph 4, the authors state 222 million have unmet need for FP but do not state which % of these are HIV positive since this is the focus of this paper. Also, the 26% is not clear. Is this the % of women with unmet need?

2. The last two sentences in paragraph 4 should be merged. The last part is not a sentence but a fragment. It reads “Many of whom are using short-term methods that require..” cannot stand alone.
3. The formula for sample size calculation need not be included in the writing. A simple description of the calculation and formula used are typically sufficient.

4. What % of women were excluded because of severe illness?

5. The median family income should be converted into US dollars so it can be easily understood by a more global audience
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