

Review of: "Prevalence and Factors Associated With Non-communicable Diseases Among People Living With HIV at Kalisizo Hospital in Kyotera District, Uganda: A Cross-Sectional Study"

Martha Chadyiwa¹

¹ University of Johannesburg

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review

Abstract :

Recommendations for Improvement:

Spell out the reasons for considering these defined NCs for examination in the background section.

Think about how you might present specific percentages of hypertension, type 2 diabetes, and depression, among other conditions, as one number or as separate figures if the data are available, to enable the audience to have a clearer grasp of the concern.

The conclusion identifies the need for customized measures, but it could be fruitful after including the strategies or tips that should be employed to reduce the chronic diseases' load among people living with HIV.

Likewise, the abstract accomplishes the major aim of the study: to describe the main results and the possible conclusions. By means of a few exceptions, it can develop as a more solid description of the study process.

Introduction:

Recommendations for Improvement:

Specify those longer sentences that are hard to understand and read and to improve the clarity and readability.

Give more strategic information about the specific moments of knowledge that the research intends to disclose.

Use citations throughout the text to lengthen the flow and to promote readability.

Among the essential components of an introductory section is the outlined study objectives. The final sentence of the introduction should provide the overall objective clearly of the study.

One may reason that the introduction has succeeded in information provision, communication of arguments, and

characterization of the context of the study, which is HIV/AIDS, and non-communicable diseases. By major editing thereof, it may well play as the foundation upon which the entire research will build, for its improvement would render it even stronger.

Methods:

Recommendations for Improvement:

Editing some of the sentences may help improve the clarity level, if there are situations where sentence structure is cryptic with many twists.

Give a short rationale for why particular kinds of hypotheses (orders) were taken into account (confidence interval, prevalence rate) for sample size designation.

State the competencies or the experience of the research assistant that was involved in the data collection.

For the research population, the choice of the age criteria as at least 35 years requires that you consider for a few minutes why this was chosen.

Overall, then, the Methods section offers insight into how the work will be structured and operationalized. With just a few small changes, this method can bolster the transparency and thoroughness of the research methodology, which is necessary to establish confidence in my work.

Data collection:

Recommendations for Improvement:

Keep some shorter sentences as they are for more clarity, especially those with complex grammatical rules.

You could broaden the explanation by including a brief explanation for the rationale behind specific measurements or classifications, especially for those to whom water quality is new. This will increase the understanding of the readers.

Cope with this situation by choosing consistent terminology and units in all the subsequent parts of the section to ensure clear understanding.

GPS should be checked carefully for any repetition or overlap of involved variables, and the next step should be cutting these out for shortening the sentence.

Under the subject of data collection, there is a description of the nature of measurements and tools to complete the data collection from the study participants. Citing the fact that it needs minimal transformations bolsters the validity of the procedure employed and the deliverability of the results.

Data management and analysis

Recommendations for Improvement:

Show only the essence of the approach for data cleaning adopted in the survey, to show openness and capability of reproduction best.

Give reasons for supporting the decision of modifying Poisson regression and applying robust standard errors, thereby clarifying the issue.

Give some instructions on the writing of the results section to make it clear which rules will be adhered to for obtaining precision in communication with the reader.

Maintain consistency with regard to terminology and units throughout the section so that it couldn't be a confusing view for a user.

Mainly, the "Data Management and Analysis" part comes out with the instructions for processing as well as analysis of the data. Through some slight major revisions, the research approach will get strengthened to enhance transparency and rigor.

Results:

All in order.

Discussion:

Recommendations for Improvement:

Consider expanding on the potential reasons for discrepancies between the current study's findings and those of previous literature. This could involve discussing differences in study populations, methodologies, healthcare settings, or socio-economic factors that may have influenced the observed prevalence rates.

Provide more detailed explanations for associations found between certain factors and NCD prevalence among PLHIV. For instance, discussing the mechanisms through which tertiary education or WHO clinical staging of HIV may influence NCD prevalence could enhance understanding.

While strengths of the study are well-described, it might also be beneficial to acknowledge any limitations or potential biases that could have affected the study findings. This would provide a balanced perspective on the research outcomes.

Overall, the "Discussion" section effectively analyzes the study findings, contextualizes them within existing literature, and highlights the implications for healthcare practice and policy. With some additional insights and considerations, the section could further enhance the depth and clarity of the discussion.