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Reviewer's report:

Summary:

This article describes the rates and challenges of HIV status disclosure during pregnancy/postpartum for women newly initiating ART during pregnancy, in the era of Option B+. The article has some interesting information included, but needs revisions to make it more succinct and accurate before publication.

Overarching editorial comments:

Double check the article for grammar and fragmented sentences

Remove bracketed explanations and incorporate included comments into the preceding sentences

Shorten extremely long sentences with many commas and reword segments to be more concise

Remove "sero" before status as another reviewer already noted

Negative events and negative outcomes are used interchangeably, and negative events is the only one defined. Also, these events seem different from one another and at least violence and stigma/discrimination should be reported on separately.

Be consistent through the manuscript on the start dates of data collection, as it's confusing having both October and February.

Report only on data included in this manuscript - references to the larger study are confusing if it isn't mentioned early on in the methods or background. Either remove all those references or include 1-2 sentences early on describing the larger study and where this population comes from. You might consider including a flow chart to help the reader see how this population is related to the larger study if you continue to include references to the larger study in the article.
You don't need to qualify, "For the qualitative component" every time, just say "The semi-structured interview guide…etc, for all instances of this.

You can't start a sentence with "Much as…" or "Majority…" You need to as the initial clauses of "As much as" or "The majority"

Abstract:
Make methods section 1 paragraph
Clarify sexual partner vs. spouse in the results section - did women report partner support or specifically spousal support? If so, this should only be among married women rather than women with sexual partners.

Use PR or PRR consistently
The 11% lower was not statistically significantly different, in fact showed almost complete equivalence, and not worthy of calling out in the abstract, unless to state that it was not different between those who had and had not disclosed.

Plain English Summary:
Define opening sentence - disclosure by who to who?
Make sure results here match results in the abstract, and vice versa

Background:
Specify where the numbers you present are from - Uganda, world, sub-Saharan Africa. It's hard to tell many places in the background text. Please make sure it's easily apparent to the reader where your reference numbers are from.

Paragraph 2 - Do you mean guidelines rather than regimens? Regimens are changing but what you describe the sentences is referencing guidelines
Maternity service - do you mean health facility service?
Methods:

Information on the FSG seems not relevant to the current article and could be removed.

Study design paragraph switches between qualitative and quantitative methods, put all descriptions for one method first and follow with the other.

Include the quantitative timeline here.

Purposively selected for what, using what criteria - you mention later differences in adherence, this information should go here.

Larger study isn’t mentioned until sample size and is confusing to have it introduced here. Please insert earlier or remove.

If reporting data on only 460, i.e.: no data on the 507, that should be the final number used in the abstract and other places in the text. If you do include some data on the 507, then this section needs to be updated.

It’s confusing the way the interviews are described. You need to explicitly state qualitative and quantitative interviews earlier in the methods section or say women were interviewed using a structured questionnaire and semi-structured interview guide.

Can remove background criteria for interviewers - their degrees are not relevant in the article.

The data collection methods quantitative and qualitative interviews sections are still describing sampling, and redundant with much of the descriptions in the sampling section.

The section on measures is redundant and you can remove almost all of the sentences following the second sentence.
You mention collecting positive and negative outcomes associated with disclosure but then only describe negative outcomes.

Do you mean partner vs. spousal support here?

As a previous reviewer asked, what do you mean by edited on site? They were administered? They were entered? Errors were identified and corrected?

You don't need to explicitly state primary outcome and secondary outcome variables.

Include a citation for the method used in qualitative analysis.

Results:

Make sure all sentences are not fragments.

Consider reporting the median and IQR instead of mean and SD.

If you include both the numerator and denominator, you do not also need to include the percentage for a descriptor.

Report the quantitative data for the qualitative population when you present the qualitative results.

Instead of FUP1 and FUP2, use the months post diagnosis (2 months, 4 months).

There are typos in this section; form instead of from, none instead of non.

If you report one side of a fraction (ie: 265 women out of 330 receiving spousal support had disclosed their status, you don't need to report the converse - remove the 65/330 undisclosed).

Did you assess variables in the multivariate model for collinearity?

Qualitative presentation doesn't require the same quantitative numbers - you can use things like majority, minority, etc.

You mention the rates of negative events being high in the abstract and few in the results. This is contradictory.

Do not need to state what's included in the specific section of the results if it's in the header for that section.
You are adjusting for a large set of variables, you can say them once and not continue to repeat them. If they are changing throughout, you need to explain why they are different for the different analyses.

Abbreviations:
Not needed unless specified by journal

Citations:
Pick a citation format. There are many errors in the current citations.
Ministry of Health is either M.o.H or Health, M.O.
Pages are listed both as the full range of pages or the page start.
Use a consistent number of authors before et al.

Tables:
Standard to report N and then median (IQR), mean (SD) or N (%) rather than proportion
You could combine table 1 with table 2 and report on baseline, 2 months and 4 months rather than having 2 tables

Table 3: It would make sense to include the N (%) for each and then the p-value if looking at differences between these factors and disclosure status

Would include both unadjusted and adjusted rates for Tables 4 and 5.
It seems like you are stratifying by too many variables in the analysis if you are adjusting for everything. How many individuals are in each category by the time you adjust?
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