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Author’s response to reviews:

Editor reports:

Background

- please provide a definition or explanation of “virological suppression” - now clarified in lines 56-58

Methods

- You may wish to clarify that screening will be carried out “independently” by two reviewers, not just in duplicate. - thank you, this has been revised on lines 151 and 154
- P8, line 165: Unclear how specifically PRISMA-P influenced your selection of data extraction items, please be clear. (“data items for extraction are informed by the items on the PRISMA-P statement and the study aims.”) - this was an error and has been removed
- Data synthesis: authors indicate that study characteristics, strata reported, etc… will be summarized narratively. However, will you be summarizing year, study period, study design geographic location by averages/means or simply report these separately for each study? - this has been clarified on lines 184-187

- Data synthesis: Also – author report that they will synthesize “odds ratios, relative risks, and proportions of persons virologically suppressed.”… does synthesize mean “calculate”? If so, it might be good to make that clearer. - this has been revised on lines 191-193

- You indicate that you have adapted the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool for use in your review. You may wish to consider additional items for non-interventional studies in which bias due to confounding might be present. - thank you, line 207 now makes mention of the inclusion of non-randomized studies

I’ve also updated the PRISMA-P checklist to reflect the new line numbers for the revision. I’ve added the cleaned version of the protocol and checklist as well now. I did not see any other requested changes in the document online.

Thank you very much for the review, and your consideration.

Regards,

Dylan Green