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Epidemiological profile of tuberculosis patients by HIV 1 status in Brazil: a retrospective cohort study

Thiago Nascimento do Prado et al

Joshua Amo-Adjei, PhD

Thank you for an opportunity to review this paper. I must say that the paper addresses an important aspect of global TB/HIV epidemiology. I will recommend its publication because of the important addition it makes to the extant literature. However:

Major compulsory revision

My understanding of hierarchical modeling is different from what the authors have presented. They give an impression that five different models have been estimated sequentially. However, the presentation is different from what I anticipated although in Table 3, five levels are shown. The reader is also not informed as to whether the models are significant and at what level?

But before a final decision is taking on its acceptance or otherwise, the authors need to have the paper edited proficiently in order to make the take home message clearer. In its present form, it is not. A number of these are highlighted for their consideration

Line 83 Studies performed … should read, “Studies conducted …”

Line 91 “Thus, models of analysis using the hierarchical multivariable analysis, could be explain or determining a causal model of TB-HIV” needs revision

Line 105 (TB – HIV) should be deleted

Line 123 should be revised: “inclusion” and “included” – one should be deleted. Perhaps, it could read “Directly observed therapy (DOT). Besides, there’s a need to justify why DOT subjects are treated as covariates.

Line 126 “abandoned” is not the right terminology – default, I guess is the right concept
I counted 9 or more uses of “plus”. This makes reading monotonous. The authors are encouraged to vary the language or may perhaps rephrase to simplify the whole paragraph.

Due to high missing information on HIV status, we carried out polynomial analysis based on the following TB treatment outcomes (default etc.) vis-à-vis HIV status (negative etc.) …”. Cured TB status was used a reference category instead of the present rendition

Line 168 on should be replaced “in”

Line 198 add “group” to age to read age group

Line 207 like should be “likely”

Line 211 “Since” should replace “As”

Some other issues the need to pay attention to include the use of indefinite article “The”. Sometimes, it is misplaced. Also, some capitalizations are misplaced because they are not proper nouns.

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

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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