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Reviewer's report:

While the authors failed to present any data or analysis in support their recommendations on the appropriate use of Pima, they do include references to a couple of recent POC cost-effectiveness studies that are models for what should be done before making a recommendation. In this case, the recommendations come from a very knowledgeable group of authors, but they are not derived directly for data presented. I would have preferred a conclusion that "additional studies can now be undertaken to determine the impact Pima could have on outcomes and costs."

However, I don't want to hold up publication of their analysis of Pima performance, since this is well within the norm, and Pima is not likely to be widely adapted because viral load is a far superior test.

I'm OK with accepting the revised manuscript for publication in BMC Medicine.

Quality of written English:Acceptable

Statistical review:No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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