Reviewer’s report

Title: Facility and home based HIV Counseling and Testing: a comparative analysis of uptake of services by rural communities in southwestern Uganda

Version: 2 Date: 19 November 2010

Reviewer: Susan Kiene

Reviewer’s report:

Reviewer’s report

----------------

The authors have been somewhat responsive to the reviewers’ comments however further attention needs to be paid to correcting the analyses and presentation of the results so that they are consistent with their stated objective of comparing the facility-based and home-based testing groups on a variety of characteristics.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. In the abstract the authors say that the objective of paper “was to compare predictors for uptake of facility and home based VCT in a rural context” but yet in the results and conclusions section of the abstract they don’t focus on comparisons. If there were no differences between the two approaches that should be stated.

2. Pg 8. The authors are confusing client initiated and provider initiated approaches. They say “Client initiated testing (VCT) can be offered through different innovative approaches such as in the work place, in mobile clinics and using the home based model.” Home-based testing is not a client initiated approach but is provider-initiated. This needs to be corrected.

3. Since the results in the present paper come from only the baseline data discussion of the details of methods of the follow-up should be removed except where initially mentioned in summarizing the context of the present paper.

4. With the multiple t tests and chi-square tests as presented in table 1 did the authors adjust p values required for statistical significance to prevent an inflation of the type II error rate?

5. I did not see the authors report the % of each study arm that accepted testing and received results. This is an important comparison point between facility and home-based testing.

6. When discussing the results from Table 2 on page 13 the authors should focus on the findings from the model including all predictors (adj ORs) not the unadjusted OR values. Focusing on findings from multiple univariate analyses
increases the Type II error rate because of the multiple comparisons being made.

7. The results presented in Table 3 and 4 should only be reported in text as they are not major findings and are merely describing the sample as a whole, not comparing facility based to home based.

8. Since the authors state that their objective is (pg. 7): “This study therefore seeks to compare predictors for uptake of facility and home based VCT in a rural context” it would make more sense to have one table that is a combination of table 1 and 2 (and 5) that compares the two study arms reporting ORs from the univariate analysis and adjORs from the multivariate analysis. In fact, the analyses relating to their objective are buried under other more general descriptive findings that they report about the entire sample.

- Minor Essential Revisions

1. In table 1 the values for the chi-square and t-tests should be reported in addition to the p-value.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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