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Factors associated with paradoxical immune response to antiretroviral therapy in AIDS patients: a case control study.

Dear Sir,

We, the authors of the above mentioned manuscript, would like to present, as stated below, a point-by-point response to the concerns brought up by the referee:

“In the entire paper: change AIDS to HIV infection”

The change was made in where it was adequate, including the title.

“Give a strong justification, both in the abstract and page 4, why the < 350/mmc CD4 cut-off was chosen”.

The justification was given. Please, refer to the text.

“Abstract, page 2, results: ‘controls were randomly selected’: this is not correct, since cases were chosen and controls were matched, as it is described in Figure 1”.

Agreed. Changed to: “controls were consecutively selected”.

“Methods, page 4: more on the CD4 cut-off. There is a different approach for starting therapy, being associated to the natural history of HIV, or obtaining a response, thus being associated to a therapeutic success. Please discuss”.

This question was addressed in the penultimate paragraph of the discussion. Please refer to the revised manuscript.

“Methods, page 4, second to the last line: ‘controls were randomly selected’, why not consecutively? (probably more correct)”.

Indeed. The suggested change was made.
“Results, page 7, sampling of cases: please state that controls were derived from 272 medical records sequentially verified”.

As requested, it was stated.

“Discussion, page 10: ‘Other studies, however’, please rephrase”.

It was rephrased. Please refer to the revised manuscript.

“Conclusions, page 13: ‘…better strategies are made…’, please rephrase”.

It was rephrased. Please refer to the revised manuscript.

“Update ref 1 to the 2010 JAMA version of the guidelines”.

It was updated.

“Check carefully the concordance between ref numbers in the text and the references in the proper section”.

It was checked.

Sincerely,

Crispin Cerutti Junior.