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Reviewer's report:

General minor comments:
What is the Institutional difference between author 1 and 2? Advise to correct the tagging of authors institution.
The authors need to thoroughly review the manuscript to differentiate use of whether and weather as in the Abstract: Results section and in the Conclusion. In general the manuscript requires thorough English revision.

Introduction:
- 1st sentence: change to =>….decline in their immune status.
- Care should be taken when using the words interchangeably clients, subjects and patients? One format should be used throughout the document.
- Page 3 3rd line from last =>….in Ethiopia indicates that both are of major public health concern.
- Authors should avoid repetitively using “we”
- Page 7, first para: symptoms reported by patients as potential predictors of the likely presence of crypt spp infection,
- Page 8, 2nd para 1st sentence: It has been documented that initiation of treatment with HAART…

Major Comments:
None

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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