

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

Benard Omondi Ochieng¹

¹ Kenya Medical Research Institute

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review comments

Manuscript title: Factors associated with outcomes of status disclosure among antiretroviral therapy attendees in public health facilities of Mekelle city, Tigray in Ethiopia

General comments:

The research study addresses an important aspect relevant to the struggle to end HIV/AIDS by 2030. In general, the manuscript is organized and written clearly, that is easy to understand. There are improvement opportunities that I feel authors should consider revising to improve the manuscript. It is imperative that the details provided in the Tables are easy to understand and the study findings are discussed with policy implications in mind.

Specific observations

Abstract

Under results, in the first statement ensure to include the total number of participants. For example, you can start like this, "Out of the 273 participants, 231 (84.6%) reported ...".

The second statement is obvious, therefore, can save you some words...

Under conclusion, the second part of the first statement, "... a significant proportion of individuals are experiencing negative outcomes..." the word significant is confusing.

The second statement under conclusion, "Therefore, healthcare providers should be aware of both the benefits and the negative consequences of disclosure" should be qualified. That is, why should they be aware? I guess they are already aware.

Introduction

The introduction is well written but can be improved by removing repeated information such as in the last paragraph. "Disclosure of HIV status is a critical ... Tigray region in general and Mekelle city in particular".

Methodology

Study area and period

In the last statement, provide period when the total number of people attending ART and disclosing their status in the city was 10,462.

Inclusion criteria

Why was it important to include those who had known their positive status for at least 6 months? I believe it would have made better sense if the time period was based on the time of disclosure so that you are sure that they have noted any positive or negative outcomes.

Sample size determination

In the second paragraph, you can delete the first part of the statement, "The sample size was calculated as follows: To determine the sample size, ..." and still convey the same message.

Provide the value of P, Prevalence of HIV status disclosure.

Data collection tools, procedures and sources of data

In the second paragraph, consider merging the statements:

The data were collected by trained health professionals.

The study used an interviewer administered questionnaire.

Data quality control

The first paragraph is a repetition.

Results

Socio-demographic characteristics of participants

Confirm that you have provided the IQR details correctly.

Also, consider providing a comprehensive Table on the socio-demographic characteristics. Ensure the Table is simple and easy to understand.

Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of participants among ART attendants who disclosed status in Mekelle city health facilities by gender (n = 273)

This Table omits important details such as age, health facility, etc. Consider including all variables assessed in this study in Table 1.

In the current Table 1, I do not understand why totals are not 273.

Did you miss Table 2.

The outcome of disclosure of HIV-Positive status

The third statement starting with, “Out of these disclosed...”, it is not possible to understand “these” in the statement.

Table 4. Outcome of HIV seropositive status disclosure among ART attendants who disclosed status in Mekelle city health facilities (n = 273)

This Table is difficult to understand. It includes details about disclosure process and four other points, which in my opinion could be lumped under positive or negative outcomes. Confirm if you really need this Table. If yes, then I doubt the importance of the following Figure. Also, the Figure can be improved if you decide to keep it. I believe your paper can summarize all your study findings using 3 Tables only.

Table 5 is also a little confusing. How do you know that the odds ratios are related to negative or positive outcomes?

Education could be different from literacy. Education level can be captured as, none, primary, secondary, tertiary while literacy can be captured as literate/illiterate. For literacy, you can use other measurable aspects such as ability to read, write and speak.

Discussion

Is it possible to specify what sex and quality of partnership predicted? That is, negative or positive outcomes?

Authors' contributions

Did the authors just review the manuscript?