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Miss Sheryl Ramos

RE: MS:  7285606121750295

Dear Sheryl Ramos:

Thank you for your encouraging response to our work. We are also grateful to the Associate Editor for providing comments that help us improve our paper. We have revised our manuscript accordingly, with the new alterations highlighted with red marks. Responses to each point of the editor’s comments were listed as below.

Thank you again for your kind consideration and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely yours,

Hung-Yi Chiou, PhD
School of Public Health, Taipei Medical University,
Mailing address : No. 250, Wu-Hsing Street, Taipei, Taiwan
TEL: +886-2-233779189; Fax : +886-2-27397137
E-mail: hychiou@tmu.edu.tw
yangch55@gmail.com
To Associate Editor:

Thank you for your positive response to our work and the constructive comments that help us improve our paper. We have revised our manuscript accordingly. Our revisions and responses are listed below:

Q1. Thank you for your responses to my comments. I just have one final issue regarding multiple comparisons for the risk of IRIS. I still don't see that you performed any statistical correction. The log rank test will do the statistical comparison but does not do the statistical correction. It's not convincing to me that there is an increased risk of IRIS with earlier treatment in your data. Table 4 shows just a (barely) increased risk when comparing 0-15 days with 31-60 days. If this is a true result, I would expect there to be a dose-response effect with the 16-30 days and >60 days. But those comparisons are not significant. Your log rank comparison table in your response is not convincing due to not correcting for multiple comparisons. I think the conclusion is likely true, I just don't see that clearly in your data. Perhaps it would be easiest just to qualify your statements on IRIS somewhat. For example, the conclusion in your abstract could be softened from "Initiation of HAART within 30 days increased risk and severity of IRIS" to "Initiation of HAART within 30 days appeared to increase the risk of IRIS".

A1. Thanks for the recommendation.

We had revised the manuscript accordingly in the Abstract section (line 60-61, revised manuscript) as follows: “Initiation of HAART within 30 days appeared to increase the risk of IRIS” and the Discussion section (line 324-325, revised manuscript) as follows: “Initiation of HAART within 30 days appeared to increase the risk of IRIS.”