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**Reviewer’s report:**

All comments are "Major Compulsory Revisions" to be made.

Abuse of initials makes the article hard to read and understand.

Most content of the last paragraph of Introduction should be included in Method.

The authors call the article a review. I think it is an original, assessing the methodology of articles on “neuroHAART”

Conclusions in page 16 are not real conclusions of the article, but ongoing discussion/comments/recommendations the authors make. Similar objections can be made regarding the Conclusion in the abstract. In my view the real conclusion is: Methodological problems in published studies impede reaching any conclusion on efficacy of “neuroHAART”.

After reading the article the proposed title “Central Nervous System Antiretroviral Efficacy in HIV infection: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review and implications for future research” seems inappropriate to me. I would propose this other one: “Assessment of methodology of published articles on efficacy of neuroHAART”.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Only in part.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes.
3. Are the data sound? Yes.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? In part.
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? No.
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Not at all.
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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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? No.
9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest
Quality of written English: Acceptable

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