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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Authors propose to undertake an ambitious task of evaluating efficacy of various vaccines in HIV infected subjects. This is a difficult task due to multiple combinations possible in vaccines used (single or combined), types of study designs, age group of study population, socioeconomic setting, severity of HIV infection and presence of co-morbidities (PEM) or co-interventions (e.g. zinc, vitamin A, ART). There is already some literature on individual vaccines

Similar to what authors propose here, there has been a more recent attempt to look broadly at all the vaccines in HIV infected patients (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24415637). Results of these studies need to be discussed while building rationale of the proposed study.

> Authors mention that they will include licensed vaccines only. Some of the studies may have been conducted when vaccines have not been licensed yet, but become licensed later on.

> Do authors intend to compare studies which have included only HIV infected subjects with those studies which enrolled HIV uninfected subjects. This seems to be so when authors mention that "We will only include studies in which some or all the participants are HIV infected, and which clearly define the assays or tests that were used to determine the infection"

> Do authors plan to conduct subgroup analysis based on severity of HIV infection.

> How do authors plan to handle data from case control studies and case series. Plan of analysis based in RR may be too simplistic for the type of review planned. Similarly what approach will be used to handle confounding factors like PEM, age at HIV infection, co-morbidities like tuberculosis. This is especially important as I anticipate large proportion of the studies to be of non-RCT design. Doing subgroup analysis for all these confounders may be impractical.

> Role of each author in the study should be described more clearly.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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