Reviewer's report

Title: Gender distribution of adult patients on highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART) in Southern Africa: a systematic review.

Version: 4 Date: 13 April 2007

Reviewer: Lalit Dandona

Reviewer's report:

General
Some further edits would be useful:

1. The authors seem to be resisting the idea of clearly acknowledging the limitation that double counting may give an erroneous impression of more confidence in the gender ratios than there actually is. For example, Table 2 suggests that there were three nationwide studies in the same time period 2001-2005 from Malawi which show a female to male ratio of 1.6-1.8. If there were substantial overlap of patients counted in these three nationwide studies, and this were not acknowledged, there would be an erroneous impression that three different large sets of patients show a high female to male ratio in Malawi. It would be useful to clearly mention this limitation in the discussion.

2. Table 2. Some percentages for the genders are missing. For study reference 32, if females were >50% the female to male ratio can be shown as >1.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)