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Reviewer’s report:

General comments:

This paper provides much needed information for adherence of ART in Lao PDR, where there are only limited publications available. However, this paper needs major and substantial revisions before re-submitted for consideration of publication.

Specific comments:

1. The primary outcome of interest is adherence. The measurement and outcome of adherence should be adequately described in the method and result sections. The authors should provide enough details of the tool, how the adherence (or adherence score the author sometime referred) is measured and calculated and what are the results. Factors related or affecting adherence could then be analysed to provide further information.

2. Again regarding adherence, as measured by “ever forgotten to take ARV medicine in the last month” and categorized as “never” and “ever”(table 4 and 5), I don’t know whether this is meaningful or rational? Do you have any references to support this categorization? Is it consistent with other references or international guidelines?

3. There are serious discrepancies in terms of adherence measurement. In the abstract, it states that “the estimation of the adherence rate was based on the information provided by the PLHIV about the intake of medicines in the previous 3 days”. However, in the result section on page 10, and in the tables 4 and 5, it states that “non adherence as a result of forgetting to take ART during the last month was reported by …”

4. There are five tables for the paper. Are all of them really necessary? Can we combine or delete some of them? Are the univariate and multivariate analysis in the table 4 and 5 exhibited in a right way, in terms of dependent and independent variables?

5. Throughout the paper and in particular the discussions, I don’t see much about adherence support, from family members, peer groups and others. Some innovative measures are considered important in other settings, such as mobile texts. Are we exploring these factors?
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