

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

Emmanuel Biracyaza<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Université de Montréal

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Report

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I find that is well-written, however, authors have to provide some clarifications and do some revisions. My comments are provided below:

### Title page:

1. I suggest the authors include the departments or schools in their affiliations on the page.
2. It is unnecessary to use "(ART)" as an abbreviation in the title.

### Abstract

1. In the abstract's first paragraph, spell out "Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV)" and then use "HIV" as an abbreviation in the following sentence to replace the word "virus."
2. Replace "Human Immunodeficiency Virus-positive" with "HIV."
3. It is not essential to use "objective" as a subheading; consider incorporating this sentence into the introduction section.
4. Revise the interpretations of results from multivariable logistic regression models. For instance, interpret as follows: "The outcome of disclosure was significantly associated with gender (AOR=3.5, 95% CI [1.110-11.272]) and the quality of the relationship with a partner before disclosure of status (AOR=0.172, 95% CI [0.045-0.647])."

### Introduction

Replace "ARV" with "ART" as ARV is a French term, while ART is English.

1. In the second paragraph, write out "UN" before using the abbreviation.
2. On page 4, create a subheading "Study Population" and eliminate the subheading "Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria." Consider integrating the text into one paragraph.
3. On page 7, avoid including operational definitions in the methods section. Instead, incorporate study variables (dependent variable, independent variables, etc.). Consider moving operational definitions elsewhere or removing them from the manuscript.

## Methods

1. Include an ethics statement in this section, addressing whether the study adhered to the regulations and standards of the Helsinki Declaration. Mention details about informed consent, confidentiality, anonymity, and voluntariness. Specify which institution or ethics committee provided ethical approval.
2. More details on data collection are needed. For example; who did data collection? What was the duration for each interview? What was the relationship between participants and researchers? How did you control the influence of such relationships.

## Results:

1. The results are effectively presented.

## Discussions

1. Clarify the study's limitations. For instance, this is cross-sectional study, which does not allow the authors to investigate causality. This study uses a small sample size and was conducted in an institution. All of the limitations can also be the barriers to generalization of the results.
2. Add subheadings such as public health implications, strengths of the study, and future directions. In the future studies, you can suggest longitudinal or experimental studies to assess causality. You can also recommend qualitative or mixed methods for exploring socio-cultural and belief influences. Future studies on large sample size (such as at national-level study can be recommended).
3. In the conclusions, provide recommendations for policy-makers or other knowledge users to enhance the quality of life by addressing identified factors.