

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Predictors of suboptimal adherence among Children on Antiretroviral Therapy in Southern Ethiopia: A multicenter retrospective follow-up study

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Dr.Rajendra Gadhavi

Submitted on: 02 Oct 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1606520

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

1. Suboptimal adherence was found to be high in the study settings having more adherence in hospitals than health centers.
2. Advanced clinical stage, low haemoglobin level, unchanged regimen, and non-disclosure of HIV serostatus were the identified predictors of suboptimal adherence.
3. To improve treatment adherence, special attention should be given to adherence counseling and training of adherence supports, especially for children with poor baseline clinical characteristics, those who are taking old regimens, and children with non-disclosed HIV sero-status.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Strength :

Statistical analysis using multiple methods
Comprehensive

Weakness :

Proper description of data collection methods

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

The study is appropriate with the correct sample size calculation. Statistical methods used for the study are valid and correctly applied with appropriate tests. The description of the study result, data interpretation, result and description are well written. References are appropriate except reference No. 38.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

No.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality



Q 10 Rigor



Q 11 Significance to the field



Q 12 Interest to a general audience



Q 13 Quality of the writing



Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study



REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Accept.