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Reviewer’s report:

Authors have generally investigated an important public health concern in the country. The method they have applied and the overall structure of the study was very convenient. However there are some suggestions that i would like to forward before considering this article for publication on BMC Public health.

1. The overall language quality of the paper is a bit limited; there are numerous grammatical errors throughout the whole manuscript. I suggest the whole manuscript to be revised by a medical writer or native English language speaker before the next submission.

   Eg1 "sometime there is no distal water to take injection

   Eg2 No participant reported missing medication or having the intension to discontinue as a result of the side

2. Write the data analysis section in a very precise manner

   E.g. "Nurses who work at the TB Clinics of the two public health center assisted in screening and selection of interviewees was performed using purposive sampling technique considering age and duration of treatment when the patients came for their medication in the morning.

   E.g. who at the same were asked to develop identify themes following the objectives of the study

Sampling concern

1. You better clearly state the sampling procedure you used to select the 10 participants including any special criteria's

2. Have you included all TB patients irrespective of certain considerations?

Example: Patients with Co-morbid illness (TB plus HIV, HPTN, or DM, etc..), Because these patients will not have similar experience and perception regarding medication adherence , as they highly burdened with a lot of medications than patients with TB diagnosis alone.
Result section

1. Authors stated that: Among the total of ten participants, only one reported missing five days' medications!

What does it mean by this?

Are there not any other patients who missed their medication for one, two or three days? Or

Was five days of medication missing Authors interest?

How Authors defined (explained) adherence to Anti TB treatment in your study?

Knowledge and belief section:

2. Make the heading of this sub theme explanatory! Knowledge and belief of what?

3. Overall I recommend authors to re write this section in a very attractive manner.

4. Its Authors personal generalization that showed knowledge and belief affect adherence to TB treatment. I have not seen any single patient explaining his perception about how patients' belief and knowledge affect patients' therapeutic adherence.

Authors simply described patients' knowledge and belief regarding TB causation, transmission and prevention. Nowhere in the paragraphs had they incorporated patients thought about the effect of Individuals knowledge on TB treatment adherence. (Remember you are using a Phenomenology study, which is all about describing participants experience and perception about something. Not simply exploring what the participants are aware of)

Perceived risk of What?

Most of your participants have been explaining their concern about perceived susceptibility to ha Drug resistant TB because of medication discontinuation.

So what that perceived risk of Drug resistant TB? Perceived risk of Complication? Be specific

Discussion

1. Authors stated that, Proportion of non-adherents in this study was therefore by far lower than those reported by other researches in the same city.

Why are they mentioning about the proportion? they never studied about the proportion of adherence. It's not a quantitative study, remember you had only 10 patients participated.
Even if we agree, you compared the finding of your research with the report of a study conducted with a cluster randomized control trial design (reference no 13), which is unreliable.

2. Generally I don't agree with the following paragraph

Your aim is not simply to assess patient's misconception about certain aspect of TB treatment; rather it's to describe patients experience on associated of TB treatment adherence. If you are implying that this is one of the determinant for DOTS treatment adherence, where is your participants thought about the relationship of Misconception and Adherence

Consistent with finding of another study conducted in Addis Ababa [20], most in-depth interviewees, however, had misconceptions regarding the cause of TB as they perceived cold air and contaminated food as causal factors. Contrary to their misinformed knowledge and lay beliefs on TB causation, most informants were well aware of its transmission and prevention as they correctly pointed out that TB is transmitted through coughing, expectorate, and breathe from TB patient, and prevented by covering mouth when coughing, putting expectorate in distance, and opening windows in public places. They also knew extra pulmonary TB is not transmittable.

3. You discussed about the effect of substance use on TB treatment adherence, but you didn't compare your finding with other reports. Otherwise, it's not important to repeat what is already mentioned in the result section

4. While discussing Health service related factors, authors mentioned that "This finding was against that of a qualitative study that indicated daily visit to health facilities for DOTS in Addis Ababa was difficult because of distance from patients' residence, lack or high cost of transportation and undesired implications on their work and social lives"

Same comment for other may phragraphs

What was your justification for discrepancy?

Good luck

Cheers

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**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.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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