Reviewer's report

Title: An integrated approach of community health worker support for HIV/AIDS and TB care in Mozambique

Version: 1 Date: 4 February 2009

Reviewer: Eliud Wandwalo

Reviewer's report:

GENERAL COMMENTS

The paper addresses issue of critical importance especially in Sub-Saharan Africa settings which bear the brunt of dual TB/HIV infection complicated with human resources shortage.

Overall the paper is well written, but is not clear to me whether the authors are reporting their experience on integrated approach of community health workers or they are presenting a review paper on this subject. If the former is true then readers will expect to be informed in details on the methodology and results which are not well explained in this paper. If the latter is true then the authors should structure their paper as such.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

1. Introduction

second paragraph, second sentence, page 2; authors used mixed reference system, please use numbering system as in the rest of the paper

2. Setting

Please provide more background of the burden of HIV and TB in Mozambique and Ango'nia district. Readers would like to know the burden of TB and HIV in Ang'nia relative to the country, how is the health system organised to cope with the problem of TB, HIV and human resource.

3. Page 5, TB volunteers

second paragraph, first sentence....against the prevailing DOTS paradigm; Please explain what do you mean and how is your approach is different from this paradigm.

The same paragraph, second sentence the author is refering to a study, is this the same study they are reporting, please provide more information or provide results

4. Discussions

The authors makes discussions of the results which have no evidence (data). For
example in the second paragraph they say their approach is acceptable but they have not shown the reader evidence of this, how did they measure this?

In the discussions, in the third paragraph authors say the approach has helped improve geographical access but in the achievements page 9, they indicate CHT have been established in 2 of 18 localities??

Authors should focus their discussions to the results

I could not find information in text which explains table 1
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