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Minor essential revisions:
1. Title: shall be corrected as ‘Prevalence of psychological distress and associated factors in tuberculosis primary health care clinics in South Africa’
2. Abstract:
   # Methods: one month of initiating shall be replaced by one month of initiation of anti-TB
   # ‘The demographic characteristics of TB were’ is not a correct sentence and should be corrected
   # Please use the word anti-retroviral therapy
   # Please merge the last two sentences together in the method section. Data on socio-demographic variables, health status, alcohol……were collected using a structured questionnaire
   # Results: Please include the OR in the result section
   # Conclusion: the last sentence is not clear: what do you mean structural interventions
3. Background:
   # The third paragraph should be revised for clarity and grammatical errors. …..Pakistan: 43% depressed, 80% hospitalized etc……is not attractive and interesting and has many errors. Please make them short by category (e.g mental illness in TB patients, the mental illness in co-infected patients).
   # Please put ‘full stop’ after reference 6. There are also similar errors elsewhere
4. Methods:
   # Please replace method by methods
   # When was the exact duration of the study (study period)?
   # This score was should be replace by these scores
# as recommended by [31] is not correct and please properly make citation (e.g. name of authors)

5. Results:

# The first paragraph should be revised for clarity: final sample included 4900, 54.5% men and ….. is not attractive

# Please omit ‘insert table in the text’

# Use punctuations properly. E.g from total samples, 76.6%

# Under TB-HIV co-infection, please split the long sentence into 2. The second sentence can be ‘Younger age (OR=, 95%CI:), being female (OR=, 95%CI), ….were associated with TB/HIV co-infection. Please avoid unnecessary words like in the multivariate analysis. This is already discussed in the method section.

# Under predictors of stress, please also split the sentences and include OR

# Please include title for the variables in table 4 (e.g. Sex: male and female, poverty level: low, medium, high etc….)

Major compulsory revisions:

1. Methods:

# How was the K-10 validated? What type of validation? Did you use the same language with the validated instrument?

# In the analysis, did you check multi-collinearity? E.g education and poverty may have multi-collinearity?

# Since income is included in the poverty scale, why did you use it separately in the analysis?

Results:

# In table 1, you did cross tabulation (chi-square). E.g marital status and sex. In this case there should be one p-value and one X2 value. Where did you get the other p-values in each category (for married, separated etc..)? Unless you did OR, you can’t have many p-values in one variable like marital status or education.

# The purpose of table 2 is not clear. Why did you stratified by sex (men and women ). This makes the table complex? Unless sex is an effect modifier, better to include sex like other variables. If you have clear reasons to know differences among sex, you can explain in the result section. In the current version, nothing is said about all those p-values in table 2?

You can simplify the table as sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of psychological distress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In table 4, non-significant values as taken as significant. E.g grade 8-11, the 95% interval indicates that the variable is not statistically significant.

Discussion:
# The discussion is short and pleased try to add logical explanation on association between variables (why is some important variable not significantly associated? What could be the reason?
General: please make thorough editorial revisions??

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

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

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