

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Burden and Challenges of Managing Hypertension in People Living with Human Immunodeficiency Virus in Sub-Saharan Africa: mixed Systematic Review and meta-analysis

Review, Int. J. Public Health

Reviewer: Reviewer 2

Submitted on: 24 May 2025

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2025.1608521

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main theme of the review.

This systematic review and meta-analysis of quantitative and qualitative literature looks at the burden, gaps and challenges of hypertension among people living with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa, with results further supporting the need for integrated HIV and hypertension care.

#### **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The strengths of this study include the inclusion of both quantitative and qualitative data, and the inclusion and analysis of variables not reported on in previous SRs on similar topics.

The limitations of this study include a low number of studies identified for certain indicators (some authors recommend a minimum of 10 studies to conduct a meta-regression and this SR does not reach  $n=10$  for all indicators). In addition, the reader is left with a general impression that less attention was paid to / detail given to the qualitative piece of the SR; as outlined below, details on qualitative data identification, extraction, analysis and interpretation are lacking and minimal compared to the detailed explanation and interpretation of quantitative data. This is a major point that should be addressed in the next round of revisions, especially as the authors explicitly mention the inclusion of qualitative data in the study as a strength.

#### **Q 3** Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

No answer given.

### PLEASE COMMENT

#### **Q 4** Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

For the most part yes, it seems the reference list covers literature relevant to the central topics of this review adequately.

Where I recommend the authors add citations is in relation to qualitative methods used, especially to better explain and justify their approach to analysis and the use/ justification for use of the bigram.

#### **Q 5** Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

**Q 6** Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

**Q 7** Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

No.

**Q 8** Does the review have international or global implications?

Yes, but these implications are not adequately expanded upon/ detailed in the current draft.

**Q 9** Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes.

**Q 10** Are the keywords appropriate?

Current keywords are appropriate, but would recommend adding 'co-morbidities' and 'meta-analysis' to the current list.

**Q 11** Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes, English is of sufficient quality. Some figures are in French - recommend these be translated for publication if they are used in the final draft.

**Q 12** Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

#### QUALITY ASSESSMENT

**Q 13** Quality of generalization and summary



**Q 14** Significance to the field



**Q 15** Interest to a general audience



**Q 16** Quality of the writing



#### REVISION LEVEL

**Q 17** Please take a decision based on your comments:

Major revisions.