

**Paper: “Combined Effect of Co-trimoxazole Prophylaxis and Safe Water on Diarrhea amongst HIV-Exposed Infants and People Living with HIV/AIDS: A Systematic Review”**

**Submitted: 14 September 2022**

**Accepted: 14 March 2023**

**Published: 31 March 2023**

Corresponding Author: Elton Chavura

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n9p20](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n9p20)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Baxter Chirambo  
Mzuzu University, Malawi

Reviewer 2: Amal Talib Al Sa'ady  
Babylon University, Iraq

Reviewer 3: Rodney Masese  
Kamuzu University of Health Science, Malawi

-----  
Reviewer L:  
Recommendation: Accept Submission  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is good and well phrased

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract is well structured. However, it should clearly show the objects, methods and results sections. These are missing.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The grammar is good with very few grammatical errors. The author needs to re-read it and edit it where necessary.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Since its a systematic review. The methods are well stipulated on how it was done. However, the author needs to check on the information written on search outcome vs data synthesis. These two have some differing information.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body is clear. Doesnt have errors worth getting concerned with.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusion is good however, needs to highlight some of the key findings of the study. There is a part talking about mortality in the conclusion. This part has not been well explained.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

There is a comprehensive list of references.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The abstract needs to be written to clearly show objects, methods, results and conclusion. There are some areas in the body which needs to be clear such as some parts of search outcomes and data synthesis. The conclusion needs to highlight more key findings.

-----

-----  
Reviewer N:  
Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

References should be written according to the journal's instructions

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, no revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

References should be written according to the journal's instructions

-----

-----  
Reviewer Q:  
Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title explicitly addresses the clinical question under study; a very relevant area worthy studying. In the title the population, intervention, as well as the outcome are clear.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract comprehensively and clearly outlines the research gap, as well as objectives, the methodology and results. In addition to outlining use of quality control measures to assess validity and relevance of selected articles, recommendations are given.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Under data collection process, it is indicated that 8 articles were selected for final analysis. However, Figure 1 shows 9 articles.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The study methods are well explained and in tandem with guidelines for systematic review studies. The use of the mixed method appraisal tool enhanced the quality of the selected articles. The search strategy was also comprehensive

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The presentation of the protocol does not have significant grammatical errors. However, some short sentences could have been joined with appropriate transitional terms to make the flow of the writeup more logical.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusion adequately highlights the content of the writeup.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The reference is comprehensive and appropriate, with all references within text included in the final list. However, there are some referencing inconsistencies in punctuation marks within the text, for instance, (Walson et al 2013; Prendergast et al., 2018).

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

This is a very important study area; the systematic review is very comprehensive. There are just a few errors to attend to as referred to in my comments.

-----