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Reviewer’s report:

Title: Assessment of service quality of public antiretroviral treatment (ART) clinics in South Africa: a cross-sectional study

General comment

The authors have responded to the comments and revised the manuscript accordingly. The discussion does not put the findings in context with research on quality of ART service delivery from African countries outside South Africa.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

Abstract:

1. Under results average duration was 4.6 hours. Is this really average or median as stated later in the paper? - please clarify.

2. Under conclusion you state “significant” (also elsewhere in the paper). This term should be reserved for findings that show significance through statistical analysis. As far as I can see you have not undertaken any statistical significance testing.

3. Discussion, last paragraph. The authors mention “low statistical power”. This seems not relevant as no statistical tests were performed. Probably mention that relatively small number of observations limits ability to generalise.

- Discretionary revisions

4. Abstract: I do not understand the logic of the opening sentence. Why does an increasing demand for ART mean that public sector ART sites in RSA are perceived as providing suboptimal care?

5. Background, last paragraph: Is RSA really a resource limited setting?

6. Results, under services accessed: “Access to services is a factor...” Probably it would be better to say: Access to services is influenced by general availability and actual availability at the day of the visit.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.