

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Prevalence of, and factors associated with, alcohol use disorder among young adults (aged 15-24 years) living with HIV/AIDS in low-income and middle-income countries: protocol for a systematic review
AUTHORS	Odokonyero, Raymond; Ocan, Moses; Kinengyere, Alison; Nakasujja, Noeline; Muhwezi, Wilson W.; Camlin, Carol S; Hahn, JA

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	KUTEESA, MONICA MRC/UVRI Uganda Research Unit On AIDS
REVIEW RETURNED	13-Oct-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Prevalence and factors associated with alcohol use disorder among young adults (15-24 years) living with HIV/AIDS in low- and middle income countries: a systematic review protocol</p> <p>Overall, I believe the authors have a strong manuscript. However, I would recommend some major revisions – mostly to organization and structure - and a few minor revisions for this manuscript to be a better candidate for acceptance.</p> <p>Major revisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Overall, the manuscript will benefit from proof reading to correct grammatical errors. There are several places where the subject-verb agreement was incorrect, and a few sentences that I had trouble following. I think detailed copyediting would be helpful.2. The introduction could benefit from re-organizing and focusing specifically on alcohol misuse among young people in the sub-Saharan African context. The last four paragraphs on AUD among PLWHA in SSA are the most relevant to your topic – please consider re-orienting the introduction around these. Consider a more succinct introduction E.g., Write 5 sentences into 4-5 paragraphs max and cite 5 – 15 references. Endure progress from general facts to specific facts, ending on how your study fits into progression of knowledge e.g<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. The general situationb. The specific situationc. The gap in our knowledge of the specific situationd. What you did to fill the gap3. Briefly highlight both individual and contextual risk factors for HIV acquisition among AGYW including biological factors.4. Please specify the rationale for including papers published since 2000 <p>Minor revisions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. You state that two authors reviewed all titles/abstracts and reviewed full texts for inclusion. How many authors abstracted
-------------------------	---

	<p>data from each article independently? How many authors performed quality assessment on each article?</p> <p>2. At which stage was inter-rater reliability assessed? Before or after discussion to resolve discrepancies?</p> <p>3. Sections of your eligibility criteria are repeated under search methods for identification of studies</p> <p>4. Please include details on how you will validate your search strategy</p> <p>5. Under data collection and analysis consider using initials to de-identify the study team.</p> <p>6. Under quality assessment methods, clarify which alcohol use measures methods you consider valid and provide the necessary citations for those</p>
--	--

REVIEWER	Madhombiro, Munyaradzi University of Zimbabwe, Department of Psychiatry
REVIEW RETURNED	15-Oct-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>BMJ Review</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>Sentence 8-12 is too long and difficult to follow, may the authors revise.</p> <p>If the experienced librarians carry out the searches using the similar search strings, how do you expect them to vary? Authors need to explain the value of this approach.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Sentence 7 needs revision, presently or in this study? It is a bit ambiguous.</p> <p>In sentence 17, dependence is not properly defined, it refers mainly to presence of withdrawals and tolerance. Authors need to be clear here.</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>Sentence 26, on objectives, the cut-off is 15-24, can the authors give the rationale for this cut-off?</p> <p>Where ever possible the patients and public have an interest on the findings of review and they may need to be contacted, what is the rationale of not involving them?</p> <p>Why was the cut-off of year 2000 made? Any justification for this?</p> <p>It is clear that the authors would want to follow the PICO here by having the intervention and comparator, this is however from an observational study point of view and the intervention/ comparator is not necessarily applicable, will authors give the justification for this?</p> <p>Sentence 50-51 speaks to two issues, that is the resolution of disagreements and the determination of statistical agreements through the Kapa. This is better served by having separate sentences for that.</p>
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Dr. MONICA KUTEESA, MRC/UVRI Uganda Research Unit On AIDS

Comments to the Author:

Prevalence and factors associated with alcohol use disorder among young adults (15-24 years) living with HIV/AIDS in low- and middle income countries: a systematic review protocol

Overall, I believe the authors have a strong manuscript. However, I would recommend some major revisions – mostly to organization and structure - and a few minor revisions for this manuscript to be a better candidate for acceptance.

Authors' response:

We thank reviewer 1 for comment regarding the strength of our manuscript.

Major revisions:

1. Overall, the manuscript will benefit from proof reading to correct grammatical errors. There are several places where the subject-verb agreement was incorrect, and a few sentences that I had trouble following. I think detailed copyediting would be helpful.

Authors' response:

We have proofread the entire manuscript and improved some grammatical errors so as to make our sentences easier to follow and understand. For example, in the first sentence of the 'Background' section, we have revised the sentence by bringing the subject closer to the verb to make it easier to understand and to convey our intended meaning.

2. The introduction could benefit from re-organizing and focusing specifically on alcohol misuse among young people in the sub-Saharan African context. The last four paragraphs on AUD among PLWHA in SSA are the most relevant to your topic – please consider re-orienting the introduction around these.

Consider a more succinct introduction E.g., Write 5 sentences into 4-5 paragraphs max and cite 5 – 15 references. Endure progress from general facts to specific facts, ending on how your study fits into progression of knowledge e.g

- a. The general situation
- b. The specific situation
- c. The gap in our knowledge of the specific situation
- d. What you did to fill the gap

Authors' response:

We have revised our introduction and background as guided and removed the elements that did not speak directly to our subject. See the revised manuscript on lines 41 – 88. Thank you for the guidance.

3. Briefly highlight both individual and contextual risk factors for HIV acquisition among AGYW including biological factors.

Authors' response:

We have revised our background to remain focused on our central phenomenon of Alcohol use disorder among YPLH. Thus, we have avoided dwelling too much on specifics of HIV or adolescent

girls and young women specifically, although we acknowledge in the first paragraph that they are a vulnerable group.

4. Please specify the rationale for including papers published since 2000

Authors' response:

We have updated and added a justifying sentence for selecting papers published from year 2000 to 2022 on lines 172-173.

Minor revisions

1. You state that two authors reviewed all titles/abstracts and reviewed full texts for inclusion. How many authors abstracted data from each article independently? How many authors performed quality assessment on each article?

Authors' response:

We describe that two reviewers will independently abstract data and two reviewers (plus one tie-breaker) will perform the quality assessment on each article. This description can be found under the 'data collection and analysis' section on lines 214 – 221.

2. At which stage was inter-rater reliability assessed? Before or after discussion to resolve discrepancies?

Authors' response:

Inter-rater reliability will be assessed before the discussion.

3. Sections of your eligibility criteria are repeated under search methods for identification of studies

Authors' response:

We agree that sections of our eligibility criteria had been repeated under the section 'search methods for identification of studies'. These have been taken out on lines 199 and 200. Thank you.

4. Please include details on how you will validate your search strategy

Authors' response:

We developed and finalized our search strategy in PUBMED and then we adapted it to the syntax and subject headings of the other databases. We have attached the final search strategy as appendix 2.

5. Under data collection and analysis consider using initials to de- identify the study team.

Authors' response:

We have updated the data 'collection and analysis' section and de-identified the study team as guided. See lines 212 - 215.

6. Under quality assessment methods, clarify which alcohol use measures methods you consider valid and provide the necessary citations for those

Authors' response:

We have updated the 'data quality assessment methods' section to clarify the alcohol use measures and added a citation and reference, as guided. See lines 234 & 235.

Reviewer: 2

Dr. Munyaradzi Madhombiro, University of Zimbabwe, Stellenbosch University

Comments to the Author:

Abstract

Sentence 8-12 is too long and difficult to follow, may the authors revise.

If the experienced librarians carry out the searches using the similar search strings, how do you expect them to vary? Authors need to explain the value of this approach.

Authors' response:

We have updated and broken down sentences 8-12 in the abstract into shorter sentences for clarity. We do not expect the two experienced librarians to vary however, the use of two librarians to add to the rigor of systematic reviews has been encouraged in our setting.

Background

Sentence 7 needs revision, presently or in this study? It is a bit ambiguous.

Authors' response:

Thank you for pointing this out. The whole background section has been rewritten for clarity in the revised manuscript.

In sentence 17, dependence is not properly defined, it refers mainly to presence of withdrawals and tolerance. Authors need to be clear here.

Authors' response:

We have updated the definition of dependence in the revised manuscript on lines 54 & 55.

Methods

Sentence 26, on objectives, the cut-off is 15-24, can the authors give the rationale for this cut-off?

Authors' response:

We are interested in young people, who have been defined by the United Nations as people in the age range of 15 to 24 years. We have provided citations for this on lines 83, 84 & 182.

Where ever possible the patients and public have an interest on the findings of review and they may need to be contacted, what is the rationale of not involving them?

Authors' response:

We have updated the 'Patient and public involvement' statement to read 'None' on line 165 in the revised manuscript, as guided. This is a systematic review and it will involve published peer-reviewed articles only. However, we have described our dissemination plan under 'Ethics and dissemination' in the abstract and in the main document.

Why was the cut-off of year 2000 made? Any justification for this?

Authors' response:

We have updated the main text to include the precise duration to be covered in the search and as well as our justification of this period on lines 170-173.

It is clear that the authors would want to follow the PICO here by having the intervention and comparator, this is however from an observational study point of view and the intervention/comparator is not necessarily applicable, will authors give the justification for this?

Authors' response:

Thank you for this observation. Indeed, we are following the PICO and as you rightly observed from a more observational standpoint. In that case, the intervention is actually an exposure such that we follow more of PECOS than PICOS. We have added the term exposures to avoid any confusion.

Sentence 50-51 speaks to two issues, that is the resolution of disagreements and the determination of statistical agreements through the Kapa. This is better served by having separate sentences for that.

Authors' response:

We have broken the sentence into two to improve the clarity of the process under the 'Data collection and analysis' section on lines 220 & 221.

*** **

COI statements:

Reviewer: 1

Competing interests of Reviewer: None.

Reviewer: 2

Competing interests of Reviewer: I have no conflict of interest to declare.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Madhombiro, Munyaradzi University of Zimbabwe, Department of Psychiatry
REVIEW RETURNED	01-Dec-2022
GENERAL COMMENTS	This is an improved version. However, there is still need work on the grammar.