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Reviewer's report:

RE: Patient satisfaction on tuberculosis treatment service and adherence to treatment in public health facilities of Sidama zone, South Ethiopia.

Major compulsory revisions:

• The overall language and structure of the manuscript need revision and substantial improvement.

• The study took perception of patients who are more likely to be adherent to the tuberculosis treatment, as this is a facility based study. Those who are motivated to take the treatment and more satisfied with the services are coming to the health facilities. Design would have been more appropriate if patients who are also non-adherent to treatment were included in the study. At the least, this limitation of the study should be mentioned in the discussion clearly.

• The author has extensively discussed the measurement tools and validation process in the paper. Cronbach’s alpha and eigenvalues are given for all subscales which may not be necessary or should be published separately. This defocuses the study from its objectives. This should be limited to one paragraph. It is important also to mention at this stage that a cut-off of 0.4 was used as a loading factor for principal component analysis. This is inappropriate for scales as it should be in the range of 0.2-0.8.

• Sample size was also discussed in detail. First of all it is too much of a detail. Formulas are not required. Secondly, the sample size was estimated based on compliance factor only and satisfaction was not considered in this regard. In addition, the correction factor applied is not appropriate. There is no mention of multistage sampling in the method however; the author has inflated the sample for design effect. The author need to revisit the whole assumptions of sample size calculation or do a post-hoc power calculation.

• Selection of participants is mentioned as “systematic random”, however it is not clear as to how it was implemented in the facilities. Please explain.

• Results: All the results where OR or Beta coefficients are mentioned in the text need revision. At many places OR with CIs of beta coefficient or vice versa is mentioned. This need to be corrected. Therefore, the presentation of results is confusing. The reader cannot make out the significance of each results as some places beta coefficient and at other OR are interpreted.

• The author is suggested to rework on the results and present the results in
sequence: descriptive, univariate analysis, and finally multivariate analysis. The tables are not clearly guiding which ones are univariate and multivariate.

Minor essential revisions:
• Three tables are labeled as Table 1. Table 2 is not mentioned in the text.

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

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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