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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Data collection and entry: Not well described
   Data analysis: Yes
   The authors do not clearly describe the cohort of patients they used in the analysis. When was it started and why did you decide to look only at the 2007-2011 window?

3. Are the data sound?
   The data that was used seemed to be limited due to the under reporting of side effects due to use of stavudine.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   No.
   The authors have to include information about the status of patient enrollment. A data flow diagram would be a better way of presenting this information showing how they finally came up with 3008 patients in the analysis.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Second sentence last paragraph in the discussion on Page 7 needs to be evaluated by the authors with regard to the quality of the data. The authors need to confirm whether there is no reporting bias of the drug side effects.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   They could be missing out on some limitation about the reporting of information on drug side effects.
   Of the patients included in the study, what proportion of the patients was initiated before 2007?

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
The abstract needs some bit of work as stated in the very first comment of the reviewer
9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes

GENERAL ISSUES TO NOTE – Minor issues
---------------------------------------
1. The authors should consider add line numbers for better review of the publication.
2. The authors did not state the objective of the study in the abstract. They mentioned very little about the data analysis methods in the abstract.
3. d4T missing under the list of abbreviations.

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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