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Reviewer's report:

This article, entitled "Quality of life in Patients treated with first line antiretroviral therapy containing nevirapine or efavirenz in Uganda: a prospective non randomized study", summarizes results from a longitudinal study where HRQL is assessed using the MOS-HIV questionnaire in patients undergoing two different ART medication (nevirapine versus efavirenz). The key findings are that ART, especially efavirenz-based regimen, improve HRQL, and that important cofactors, like depression or gender, need to be accounted for when initiating ART.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Since the authors report previous studies that consider 80% as a cutoff to define adherent vs. non-adherent patient, it may be worth justifying the use of a threshold of 95% (l. 121) in the present study.

2. l. 150 "with a p value <0.20 for PHS and GPGI and a p value <0.10 for MHS" Is this done a posteriori? I.e., how were these thresholds selected: after having fitted the model, or beforehand? This should be clarified, in my opinion.

3. Figure 3 and Table 2 summarize GPGI as median scores while other figures and tables display average value. Is there any reason to use median for GPGI? I didn't found any explanation in the text.

4. At the end of the Results section, it might help to report whether any factor were found to be associated to two or more of the available summary measures (PHS, MHS, GPGI) in each treatment groups (e.g., study visit for EFV in the case of PHS and MHS). Likewise, a list of variables common to all 6 models might be helpful.

5. Did the authors check whether the depression effect was moderated by gender? I.e., is there an interaction between gender and depression, especially regarding MHS?

Discretionary Revisions

l. 140 I should note that categorizing a continuous (or assumed so) predictors is not recommended
Minor Essential Revisions
- l. 47: "less than I copy/ML" replace I with 1
- l. 103: "instead of tenofovir" missing dot
- l. 106: "Patents" should read "Patients"
- l. 151: "on order" should read "in order"
- l. 152: "a stable model" missing dot
- l. 156: "were considered in final the multivariate models" in the final multivariate models?
- l. 169: STATA should be spelled Stata
- l. 181: "of all the" among all the?
- l. 212-213: "there was 0.57" there was a 0.57?
- l. 218: "EFZ," should read "EFZ:"
- l. 301: "Female gender was associated" should probably be reworded

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests