

Review of: "Factors Associated with Outcomes of Status Disclosure among Antiretroviral Therapy (ART) Attendees in Public Health Facilities of Mekelle City, Tigray, Ethiopia"

Ivan Segawa¹

¹ Makerere University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

INTRODUCTION:

Paragraph 2: UNAIDS not SDGs aim to end AIDS by 2030. I don't see the relationship between sexual transmission, status disclosure, and SDGs; Maybe link HIV acquisition with promiscuity and link disclosure with stigma and UNAIDS goals.

Paragraph 3: Revise to 24 countries not states. Readers might be confused with the US.

Paragraph 7: As far as my level of knowledge goes... I see two authors and our may be a more appropriate pronoun.

METHODS:

Study area: Are services offered free of charge? What level of hospitals are they?

Data processing and analysis: For cross-sectional studies, prevalence ratios (estimated through modified Poisson regression models with robust standard errors) may be more appropriate than odds ratios, especially when the outcome is not rare (<10-20%). Also, since the data was collected from separate facilities, did you adjust or check for clustering?

RESULTS:

Socio-demographics: Please state the lower and upper quartile instead of the range for IQR for age. In table 1, why did you stratify by sex and not facility? Since it's not a comparative cross-sectional study, it might even be better to have unstratified statistics.

Factors associated: Consider using 2dp instead of 3dp for OR. Also, when you use the word "more likely," you are already interpreting the results. I am concerned about how the quality of the relationship was measured: quarrelsome vs peaceful. I have seen other metrics for measuring quality of relationship and you might have considered only one dimension. I would consider this factor as a peaceful relationship instead of a good quality relationship.

LIMITATIONS:

Do you think there's social desirability or reporting bias?

