Reviewer’s report

Title: Genetic Diversity and Drug Resistance among Newly HIV-1 Diagnosed Individuals in Western Yunnan: Hot Area of Active Recombination in China

Version: 1 Date: 22 October 2012

Reviewer: Maurizio Zazzi

Reviewer’s report:

1. [minor essential revision] Abstract. Replace “reverse transcriptional polymerase chain reaction” with “reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction”.

2. [minor essential revision] Page 8. “A total of 299 HIV-1 pol sequences were obtained from 320 plasma samples.” is actually a result. It is indeed correctly reported in the Results section and should be removed from Methods.

3. [minor essential revision] Legend of Table 1 should be modified to reflect the fact that also resistance data are included. Another, maybe preferable, option is to remove the resistance data from this table. Resistance data are given later in the text and in Table 4. Since it is stated in the text that there was no association between drug resistance and demographic factors, resistance data can be safely removed from Table 1.

4. [minor essential revision] Page 11. It is unclear from the text and Table 2 what the statistically significant difference (P = 0.013) refers to. Is it the different prevalence of subtype C in IDUs vs. heterosexuals? This should be clarified.

5. [minor essential revision] Page 11. The comparison between year 2009 and 2010 in terms of prevalence of drug resistance does not make much sense given that the periods considered are narrow and close to each other and particularly because these are just the year of genotyping, not the year of acquisition of HIV infection.


7. [minor essential revision] BC recombinants were described in Dehong before 2002 but they were not labeled as either CRF07 or CRF08. Since methods to detect recombinants may have been different in previous and the present papers, it is worth considering re-examination of the old sequences described in previous papers to confirm that the CRF07 and CRF08 detected in this work have not been present before.

8. [discretionary revision] The Discussion section is unnecessary long, I think it could be shortened without loss of the important points.
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