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Reviewer's report
Title: Antiretroviral treatment adherence among HIV patients in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa
Version: 2 Date: 1 February 2010
Reviewer: Jeffrey Weiss
Reviewer's report:
The authors write in the abstract that 'for both indicators adherence was associated with low depression and poor environmental factors.' The direction of these relationships are in opposite directions however. Better adherence is associated with low depression. Poorer adherence is associated with poor environmental factors. This lack of clarity occurs frequently throughout the manuscript. It would help the reader if the authors do not discuss 'adherence being related to....' but rather always specify the direction by discussing either 'poorer adherence being related to...' or 'better adherence being related to...'
R: corrected

Was this study reviewed by and/or approved by an IRB or Board of Ethics?
Regardless of the answer, this should be mentioned.
R: added, as below
Ethics approval was obtained from the HSRC ethics committee and approval was obtained from the Provincial Department of Health in KwaZulu-Natal.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a
Reviewer's report
Title: Antiretroviral treatment adherence among HIV patients in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa
Version: 2 Date: 22 January 2010
Reviewer: Christian Laurent
Reviewer's report:
The revised article can be accepted without revision. I think there is a typo mistake: "All variables statistically significant at the P<.01 level in bivariate analyses were included in the multivariate model" (data analysis section): I suppose that variables were retained in multivariate analysis if p was <0.1??
R: The reviewer earlier suggested P<0.1; this was seen as a typo (it would not make sense), and the initial model of P<.05, was changed to P<.01, as it was understood, as the suggestion made

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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