

## Reviewer's report

**Title:** Pattern of neuropsychological performance among HIV positive patients in Uganda

**Version: 2 Date:** 24 October 2006

**Reviewer:** Robert Paul

### Reviewer's report:

#### General

This is a well written paper that describes neuropsychological performances in HIV-positive patients in Uganda. The paper is important, as little information is known regarding neuropsychological outcomes associated with clades A and D. I have only a few suggestions for the authors.

-----  
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. The abstract notes that the group differences were largely driven by HIV-positive individuals with WHO stage 4 disease. I didn't see these results laid out in the results section of the paper. The authors are encouraged to describe these results in the body of the paper.
2. It appears that the two groups of participants differed notably on education (mean of 9.1 vs mean of 12.0). The authors should consider correlational analyses to determine whether education is related to neuropsychological performances and if so, run ANCOVAs with education as the covariate.
3. The authors are encouraged to discuss their findings in the context of other recent international studies of nonclade B HIV (e.g., Yephthomi et al, 2006, JINS).

-----  
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Were all HIV-positive individuals treatment naïve?
2. The WHO neuropsychological battery has been administered in multiple countries and it may be useful to inform the reader whether the battery has been administered in Uganda and translated into Luganda. In the event it hasn't been translated, could the authors comment on whether the items were reviewed for specific utility in this culture.
3. Could the authors comment on how many individuals were tested in each language (English vs. Luganda) for each group? Did these language groups differ on the tests within and across serostatus?
4. Presumably the specific clade status of individuals in this study was not known. If true, it may be useful to comment in the discussion as to whether the authors would predict any differences in cognitive outcome between these two clades.

-----  
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)  
None

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests