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Reviewer's report:

1. the nurse validation step includes information that should be in the chart and not solely based on the nurses knowledge for example, chronic illness or mental illness. How would you implement this if the nurses didn't know the patients? So is the nurse reading their chart after they are flagged for high risk?

An aside, that can't be addressed here, but in the future you should consider - there are no nurses on your team as indicated by your title page. Nurses are very involved in this project and the they are the ones that are doing the intervention, so there should be a nurse on your team.

2. pg 8 line 43. What do you mean by motivational communication and how were the nurses trained?

3. pg 8 line 54 I'm not clear about the visits. Do you mean advanced practice nurse for the first visit? Why do they need two visits? How does the nurse visit and the physician visit different. It seems getting them to two visits would be very hard if they were truely OOC to begin with.

4. Where is your evidence that calling every week for six months is an effective method for re-engagement? I think you said this was evidence based, no articles are cited here. It seems excessive and that there would be a point you would not be getting any more people re-engaged in care.

5. Pg 13 line 58. What do you mean by HIV specialist nurse? Do you mean nurses with board certification or advanced practice?
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