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Dear Authors:

I have read with great interest the manuscript entitled: "Survival analysis of time to cured on multi-drug resistance tuberculosis patients in Amhara region, Ethiopia". I feel that the article need some changes.

**Small Mistakes**

Page 6 paragraph 2, "the frailty term was first introduced by". Please finish the sentence

Bibliography: Ref 37 and 44 could be the same reference.


Tables. Standardization the numbers. Two or three decimals is enough. Avoid the 0.000 for significance, is better <0.01 or <0.001. Avoid verticals lines and reduce the use of horizontal lines.

Table 3. The variable Drug Using History is splitted in two cells.

Table 5. Avoid capital Greek letters in the caption. Γ is not γ. . is not clear in the table 5 (Time Ratio), please added at the caption.

I feel that other aspects could improve with few changes.

**Material and methods**

The manuscript shows brilliant results and a statistic adjusted to the objective. I congratulate the authors for that. However, it is an article difficult to read for those who are not familiar with
statistics. Personally I would invite the authors to simplify the "material and methods" section, explaining in a global way the shades of the models and their application, avoiding cumbersome formulation. Minimizing the bibliography in this regard. In this sense, the fundamentals of the models and how they apply to the context described by the authors and their formulation are much more interesting than the cumbersome formulation.

Results

If the interactions are studied in the results, they must be taken into account when calculating the TRs, since these vary according to the interaction. This fact has not been taken into account and it do not appear in the results or the discussion sections.

Discussion.

The discussion again describes the data without contributing implications in the field of Public Health. Basically, the statistical aspects are discussed and if the model fits better or worse, nevertheless, the implications are few in the field of the Public Health.

For example. What does it imply that there is a clustering effect due to hospitals in the Health Policies?

The discussion is not very deep for such good results.

Conclusion.

It should be more direct, a judgment or a decision to make after an argument. Much sentences or ideas of this conclusion should place in the discussion section.

In general, it is a good manuscript with impeccable statistics but the discussion on public health aspects could improve.

Kind Regards

Pablo Caballero
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