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**Reviewer’s report:**

Mooij et al. paper has improved.

However, I still have a huge concern about the way the study was conducted ethically.

The authors’ argument that patients were not informed about the study, as is common in retrospective studies is not convincing. It will be difficult to justify this to readers and peers anywhere else in the world especially given that the project was up and running and the patients’ data were used immediately after death or discharged. Staff members were aware of the study. Why didn’t the authors ask consent from the patients when this was possible? Why put patients in the dark? I don’t think this study can be considered as a true retrospective study. Seeking ethical advice from the District Medical Officer is enough. You need ethical committee.

To put simply, the method applied for the data collection is not in line with international standards or national data protection standards in the Netherlands. Full ethnical review by Tanzanian national medical committee (National Institutes of Medical Research) is required before this study can recommend for publication as this study has a huge potential to tarnish the image of people working in research field in low and middle income countries.
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