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Reviewer's report:

This is a retrospective cohort review of HIV-infected children in Ethiopia. The data are from 2014 to 2017. The manuscript is well written and easy to follow. My comments to authors are as follows:

1. The author included all subjects (87) who took abacavir but decided to include only some subjects (92 of 212) who took AZT into the analysis. What is the rationale for that. Do those included truly represent those who were excluded in terms of clinical and demographic characteristics?

2. Co-morbidity data were collected as stated in Study Population and Variables. However, I do not see them in Table 1. Any difference in co-morbidity between 2 groups?

3. Regarding Opportunistic infections (OI), how do authors define/diagnose bacterial pneumonia clinically, radiographically and microbiologically?

4. Are there other OI encountered in the study populations besides bacterial pneumonia? If so, they should be included in findings.

5. What was the difference in adverse drug reactions between the 2 groups?

6. The author suggests that patients with anti-TB treatment were 3 times at higher risk of having OIs. Authors should include other studies that demonstrate similar findings. I think this is an important observation.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English  
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