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Author’s response to reviews:

July 26th, 2017

Dear Editor,

Manuscript No: REPH-D-16-00017

“HIV status disclosure and associated outcomes among pregnant women enrolled on lifelong antiretroviral therapy in Uganda: a mixed methods study”

Thank you for this opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript. The revisions have been made in line with the comments received. Below is a point-by-point response to all the comments.

Sincerely,

Rose Naigino
Response to reviewers’ comments

1.0 Methods

1.1 Sample size

A total of 500 HIV positive pregnant women were estimated to be needed to address the primary objective of assessing retention in care and adherence to ART.

If this is stated as the primary objective of the study presented it must be central to the results and discussion.

Response:

Dear Editor, I agree with you entirely. Thank you for pointing out this discrepancy.

This statement has been rephrased to ensure that the primary objective of this study aligns well with the results and discussion. Please see the revised statement on page 7 of the manuscript with track changes.

The revised statement below clearly outlines the primary objective as expected.

A total of 500 HIV positive pregnant women were estimated to be needed to address the primary objective of determining the prevalence of HIV status disclosure and its outcomes for pregnant women newly initiating lifelong antiretroviral therapy.

1.2 Measures

The primary outcome variable was ‘HIV positive status disclosure’ while the secondary outcome variables were ‘outcomes or consequences of disclosure’.

This does not correspond with the objective listed. This is a big disconnect in the purpose and approach to the study.
Response

Again, thank you for highlighting this discrepancy.

This disconnect between the primary objective, results and discussion has been addressed throughout the paper.

Your concerns are very much appreciated. Please accept our apologies for this oversight.

2.0 Discussion

This study assessed the prevalence of HIV status disclosure, as well as the outcomes for pregnant women newly initiating lifelong ART in Uganda.

From reading the paper, this seems to be the appropriate objective. Review what is currently stated.

Response

Yes, you are right. This indeed is the appropriate primary objective that corresponds with the results and discussion. As advised, what was previously stated has been reviewed. Thank you.