

Paper: **“Immunological Responses to Helminths and HIV-1 CoInfections”**

Submitted: 24 January 2023

Accepted: 02 March 2023

Published: 31 March 2023

Corresponding Author: Elton Chavura

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n9p211](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n9p211)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Priscilla Funsani

Mzuzu University, Malawi

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Monica Butnariu

University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine "King Michael I,
Romania

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title is very clear

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract has clear objectives, methods, and results
however Line 29 and 30 We reviewed 2032 citations, evaluated 432 abstracts, and read 10 articles (See PRISMA diagram). It should read included 10 articles according to the PRISMA diagram

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

Abstract

Lines 19 to 20 -To date, there is insufficient evidence as to whether helminths have influence (add an influence)

Line 33 The magnitude of effect ranged from 5.28 log₁₀ copies/mL (add the effect)

Line 35 All but one RCT reported decline in plasma (remove space between reported and decline)

Introduction

Line 53 (MTCT) of HIV, by a mechanism in which parasite antigens activates (activate)

Line 57 and 58 Concurrent infections with NTDs such as helminths and HIV-1 is common among persons (is should be are)

Line 59 to 61 The type 1/ type 2 model of immune responses to infection suggests a detrimental effect of helminths infection, since the balance in favor of type 2 cytokines at the expense of type (helminth infection and remove coma)

Line 71 infectious tropical diseases, are much alive and primarily concentrated in poor (remove space between alive and and)

Table 1 Asia, Africa and Latin America (add coma after Africa)

Line 89 and 90 During an acute phase of infection, HIVreproduce in large amounts and destroy CD4+ cells and levels typically fall quickly at first (HIV reproduces in large amounts and destroys)

Line 91 As the immune system (remove space between as and the)

Line 97to depletions in CD4+ T-lymphocyte cells, (Blackwell et al., 2016) and ((Blackwell et al., 2016) andadd coma before and)

Line 104 and 105 CD4 count is the best predictor for the immune function, hence useful in the identification of advanced HIV (remove the before immune and space between of and advanced)

Line 114 Viral load test result (add s after result)

Line 118 A normal viral load may indicate: Low risk of HIV infection. (remove:)

Line 128 recently treated for helminthisis (spelling)

Line 151 and 152 in any systematic review with a quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods approach. We also specified our hypotheses before conducting the analysis (put coma after qualitative and remove space between our and hypotheses
Line 159 they could be reviewed against the set inclusion criteria. (remove space between be and reviewed)

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Improve the subheading of table 1 by adding a column of how many you found under each database and how many you included. This should agree with the search outcome or the subheading on the result can be improved for easy understanding
Line 167 and 168 Four review authors extracted data independently; discrepancies were tabled for discussion. (was an agreement reached after the discussion? Please indicate)

Improve table 2 subheadings for easy understanding

The search period was set from the period starting from January 2010 to December 2022, covering a period of 12 years but Table 2 shows three studies done before 2010. Can you please clarify the difference?

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

Grammar and punctuation issues need to be addressed

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

yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

It is comprehensive but needs to add the latest references, some are too old

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

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]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In general, the paper needs some grammar corrections, and the methodology needs to be reviewed. Please make sure you remove all old references.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

yes

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

yes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

yes

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

yes

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

yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This manuscript entitled "Immunological Responses to Helminths and HIV-1 Co-Infections: A Systematic Review" could be good for publication in European

Scientific Journal, ESJ.

This may be interesting, but some important points need to be resolved. Importantly, a study must provide a critical analysis of the data. In other words, you must assess whether specific data published really stand up to scientific scrutiny. In order to achieve the above, you must clearly define your specific aims and objectives. So in your study you must develop a critical appraisal of the state of the art. This is an essential element of any article. There are important scientific questions (both conceptual and methodological) which need to be addressed with the primary studies. A study must highlight this. The introduction, which is written in clear language, covers a number of relevant issues. Information are noteworthy, and not are correct supported by similar results from the specialty (see PMID: 23206805, PMID: 22453797; PMID: 35810693, PMID: 36137983, PMID: 35996526. PMID: 35748273.). Try to rewrite the abstract and conclusions, I also recommend the nuance of the introduction, the way of working is not very well explained, the procedure is tedious and unsustainable. For this reason, I recommend that the authors try to use more sustainable methodologies, the interpretation of the results can be improved/ reformulated,

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Need to add Hepatites C

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

No..need more clarifications

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

Ni

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

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

Some revisions required

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

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Need more updated references

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
