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Reviewer's report:

Compulsory

The purpose of the paper is not clear. The authors appear to mix up the terms non-response bias and refusal of testing. Is the outcome of interest non-testing or HIV status? When the authors use the term “refusals” do they mean “refusal to get tested”? How do they know the status of participants who refused testing? The authors should have a sentence at the end of the background stating the purpose of the study.

Table 1 does not seem pertinent to the paper and should be removed

Table 3 – this table is too dense and doesn’t add much beyond what is stated in Table 4. I’d remove it.

The statistical methods are not well explained. Why did they add age squared? Heckman model needs more explanation.
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Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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