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Reviewer's report:

General impressions – analysis of the article "Directly Observed Therapy following tuberculosis treatment regimen change in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: a qualitative study"

The manuscript presents errors both in your typing and translation;

Two of the three keywords presented are not indexed by the Medical Subject Headings (MeSH);

In the introduction, contextualizes the problem of tuberculosis in the country, the historical aspects of the evolution of the treatment of TB. However, cites the name of services in which the study was conducted, this compromises the ethical aspects related to scientific research, making possible the identification of the subjects of this research participants;

Discusses the methods used in the research (semi-structured interview and focus group), uses a software for data analysis (Open Code 3.5), but not an author adopts as a reference for the analysis, this compromises the quality of work;

Put a few references in the discussion of the work;

References contained in the list at the end of the manuscript are not formatted properly.

In relation to the guiding questions proposed by the BMC:

1. The manuscript does not have well-defined guiding question;

2. The methods are well described, but it is suggested not to cite the locations where data collection were made. In addition, it could bring the name of the route used or quoting the items that it contains. As quoted above, the authors could rely on an author as analytical reference (Bardin, for example, who works with the content Analysis – Thematic Mode). Finally, it is suggested that, to raise the quality of work, use the COREQ (Consolidated reporting criteria for qualitative research);

3. The data presented (fragments of the speeches of those interviewed) could be demonstrated with a smaller amount of words (the words presented are extensive), which can make the reader get lost in reading;

4. The figures submitted are genuine, have no evidence of manipulation. However, it presents formatting errors;
5. Discusses the liability in connection with the Data Guard, but does not cite standard followed;

6. Discussion and final considerations have relationship with the results. However, does not present the degree of intensification necessary. Uses few scientific articles and focusing more on international guidelines. The articles should have greater prominence;

7. The manuscript does not discuss the limitations of the study, this compromises the same;

8. The authors acknowledge the work that they’re building, that are published or not published;

9. The title and the abstract correspond to what was found at work. However, the use of descriptors is inadequate from the moment in which the authors present two of these without being indexed;

10. The writing has typos and inappropriate terminology used at certain times, this compromises the quality of the study.

Despite the manuscript presented reporting a study from a priority country for the control of tuberculosis due to the large number of cases that presents, the same does not meet fully the methodological prerequisites to allow its publication in this periodical. In this way, the same shall be deemed to be denied.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**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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