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EDITOR
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Title: Maintaining relevance in HIV systematic reviews

This manuscript is a very short (letter) review that aimed at evaluating the methods and relevance of 148 HIV systematic reviews and protocols published in the Cochrane Library over a 15-year period. Authors aimed to determine the need to update published reviews or complete of reviews in progress. They have found that 87% of protocols and reviews were identified as not for updating or progression to publication, mostly due to research questions which were either entirely outdated or addressed questions in an outdated manner. Authors have also concluded that some research questions were also inadequately conceptualized, particularly when complex pragmatic trials or behavioural interventions were included. This is a short (but valuable and meaningful) manuscript, of relevance to readers. It is also well written and deserves publishing. Due to its short size and scientific soundness, I truly don't have much to say negatively and advise publication after small modifications/changes. Could authors better explain inclusion/exclusion criteria? Include the publishing years of these reviews (could only see in "results")
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