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Reviewer's report:

Tuberculosis in general and MDR TB specifically, are important public health issues especially in the context of high burden countries such as Indonesia. Any barriers in providing care to cases of MDR TB as a result of stigmatization could have serious programmatic as well as biological consequences. Hence, this research is an important issue under study. However, the manuscript has serious methodological issues, specifically for qualitative data collection. Hence no comments made on the findings.

Examples of methodological issues include:

Quantitative arm is not powered to make conclusions. Results from even knowledge related questions can't be relied upon as the study is under powered.

Qualitative arm is not well documented to draw conclusions. The data was not collected, analysed and presented according to standard protocols, and procedures (Like COREQ). There is no description of how the qualitative thematic guide was developed for the study. Section also lacks the mention of the major themes on which the qualitative data was collected. Additionally, results section doesn't have adequate mention of qualitative findings. Only one quotable quote was used out of 32 interviews reportedly conducted in the study.

Even qualitative sampling is supposed to be representative. For example, majority respondents are females in the qualitative arm. Is this representative? If not then gender could introduce a bias if related to patient care and stigma

Over all, not adequate evidence (both in terms of quality and quantity) to derive conclusions

Hence, can't be recommended for publication.
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