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General comments on Scoping review protocol (SRP) work content: This SRP: "Scoping review on rehabilitation approaches for children living with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa": is an important topic for children living with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa. The process of documenting this SRP was properly structured, but few points need considerations, and my suggestion is to use a more specific approach, as current approach appear to be unclear, Further attention is needed, while following properly BMC Systematic Reviews guidelines of producing a SRP, and address key points raised by reviewer comments made below.

There were a number of errors, just to state few of them: sentences constructions (long sentences usage) just to state this, concepts usage, unnecessary repetitions, language manipulation, clear assignment of tasks to authors, and their details, all those comments do need improvements prior to this SRP publication.

Following BMC Systematic Reviews guidelines of producing a SRP, and update contents of each point made by reviewer below may assist authors to enhance evidence on rehabilitation approaches for children living with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa. Evidence is certainly needed on this SRP, this SRP do not makes a proper systematic attempt trying to lay a good foundation requirements towards producing this SRP to address this issue on children living with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa, but visiting BMC Systematic Reviews guidelines of producing a SRP, may assist authors provide an improved version of this SRP based on the changes to be made, with acceptable clarities.

Background: Page: 6, Line: 139 to 142 please rephrase this work content part; convey this sentence ideas with few words, and carefully connect this sentence parts using less 'and' connector.
Methodology: Page: 8 line 172, Please can you rephrase this lines contents 'last decade (2012-2019)', when counting year this sentence is not acceptable.

Methodology/Eligibility: Page: 8 line 195, please, can you explain, what do you mean by: "Studies set at home "?

Methodology/Exclusion criteria Page: 9 Line: 212, please, rephrase this sentence, as there is some form of repetition.

Identifying relevant literature: Page: 9 to 10, Lines: 221, please, avoid using: 'Thereafter' to start this sentence. Try to be precise: 'Repositories of higher education institution', which institution Repositories?

Please find a way to combine ideas convey in line 221 & 231, Page: 10, as there is some form of repetition.

Line 237, Page 10, Are you not here carrying a Pilot search instead?

Collating, Summarizing and reporting results Background: page: 11, Lines: 258, please explain the concept: 'efficacy of studies' used here.

Quality appraisal Page: 12, lines 268 to 269, please, it is better to provide reviewers details and tasks at this stage.

Discussion Page: 12 8 lines 286 to 289, please revisit this sentence, as current work is at 'Scoping reviews protocol' stage, not yet a 'Scoping reviews'.

Final Comments: Inappropriate systematic approach to the documentation of this SRP, there are few points to be address by authors in the current draft manuscript. An improved version is needed, after visiting BMC Systematic Reviews guidelines of producing a SRP. Finally, it is recommended that this SRP report follows BMC Systematic Reviews submission guidelines, before it can be considered for re-submission of this important topic on children living with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa.
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