



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_13535
Title of the Manuscript:	Improving Education Opportunity, Health, and Quality of Life of Orphans and Vulnerable Children: The Sustainable Action against HIV and AIDS in Communities (SAHACOM)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Hypotheses: The major shortcoming of this manuscript is lack of clear formulation of research hypotheses. Clear formulation of hypotheses is necessary. I can see and I suggest at least three hypotheses for this study: <u>Hypothesis 1:</u> SAHACOM improves education opportunity of OVCs. <u>Hypothesis 2:</u> SAHACOM improves the health status of OVCs. <u>Hypothesis 3:</u> SAHACOM improves the quality of life of OVCs. This formulation should be followed by a presentation of the operational definition for each key study variable: education opportunity, health status, and quality of life. Moreover the manuscript would need to discuss the analytical procedures envisioned to assess the validity of each of the aforementioned hypotheses. Material and Methods: The methodology is weak in that it does not connect clearly with study questions and hypotheses. No operational definitions have been provided! Discussion of Results: It is more advisable to first present the findings under the "Results" section. It is after this presentation of the findings that a discussion should follow. In this vein, a clear discussion of the results should be based on the hypotheses and carried out in a more systematic way. After the presentation of the results, a discussion should follow, integrating current findings and discussing their relevance within a broader framework of interventions aimed at improving the life prospects of OVCs. I wonder whether or not it would not be more beneficial to interpret the findings in the framework of Maslow's hierarchy of needs. In this vein, subjects would be expected to demonstrate increased propensity to pursue higher order needs once their low-level needs have been met.	We are grateful for the constructive comments raised by the reviewer. These advices are very helpful to improve the quality and accuracy of the manuscript. We have accepted all the comments and addressed them carefully in the manuscript. All the revised parts are highlighted in yellow as recommended. Hypotheses: We have added three important hypotheses as suggested. We stated that: 'We hypothesized that the SAHACOM is effective in improving education opportunity, food security, and general health and quality of life of OVC in communities in Cambodia.' Please see L77-79, p4. As advised, we have also provided operational definition of the key outcome indicators including education



SDI Review Form 1.6

		opportunity, food security, and overall health and quality of life status and discussed the analytical procedures envisioned to assess the validity of each of the aforementioned hypotheses. Please see L86-92, p4. <u>Material and Methods:</u> In relation to earlier comments, this issue has been addressed as suggested. Please see L86-92, p4. <u>Discussion of Results:</u> We are not very sure whether we understand the reviewer's comments correctly. In its current form, we have presented the results first and provided discussion afterward by integrating current findings and discussing their relevance with the framework of the interventions which aimed at improving the life prospects of OVC.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments Issue 1: Grammar & Spelling: Issue 2: Number of provinces from which participants were recruited Issue 3: Notes under the tables Issue 4: Logical flaw/ lack of clarity Issue 5: Grammar/spelling	Issue 1: Page 1, line 20: Replace “have” with “has”! Issue 2: Page 4, lines 74-75: You stated “Participants were recruited from five provinces including Battambang, Kampong Cham, Pailin, Pursat, Siem Reap, and Takeo.” However, your list enumerates SIX provinces. Which number is the correct number (5 or 6?). if the number of provinces is 5, then you would need to remove one of the six provinces. Which one? Under <u>Table 2</u>, you have included a note regarding SD. This note is not needed as this acronym has not been used in this particular table. The same is valid for <u>Table 3</u>. Under <u>Table 4</u>, you have added p-value and implementation partners (IP) in the notes. These two terms have not been used in the title of body of the table. They are not needed here. Page 9, lines 283-286 You stated: “Children’s education seems to be more valued ~~not only due to~~ the increase in school attendance but the substantial increase shown when respondents were asked about the most important needs for daily family living, and school supports were reported at 45.7% at midterm and 80.9% at end line.” School attendance is NOT causing increased valuation of education; it is rather an illustration of the value attributed to education. Therefore, it would be more accurate to say: “Children’s education seems to be more valued as illustrated by the increase in school attendance and the substantial increase shown when respondents were asked about the most important needs for daily family living, and school supports were reported at 45.7% at midterm and 80.9% at end line. Page 9, line 287: Consider replacing “The increase value of education could be due to the fact that OVC and their family were receiving social 288 supports, allowing for opportunities that were not previously available.” By “The increased value of education could be due to the fact that OVC and their family were receiving social 288 supports, allowing for opportunities that were not previously available.”	- The error has been corrected. Please see L20, p1. - The correct number is 5. Kampong Cham was not included as a site for OVC study, and it has been removed from the list. Please see L99-100, p4. - The error regarding the footnote for SD has been corrected for Table 2 and Table 3. Please see L241-242 and 256, p8. - The error on footnote under Table 4 has also been corrected. Please see L273, p8. - As advised, the expression has been revised. Please see L305-308, p9. - The next sentence has also been revised as suggested. Please L309-310, p9.
Optional/General comments	Your abstract is misleading when it indicates that you have collected and used baseline data. This has not been done as you have stated yourself. You have instead used mid-term data and other coming from your review of administrative sources. Based on this reality, your abstract would need to be amended to reflect the exact nature of data used.	As suggested, we have revised the wording in the ‘Methodology’ in the abstract stating that: ‘A two-stage cluster sampling method was used to select 756 OVC at midterm and 785 OVC at end line for face-to-face interviews. Outcome



SDI Review Form 1.6

		indicators from end line (2014) were compared to those obtained at midterm (2012). Where possible, the data were also compared with data obtained from baseline documentation (2010).' Please see the abstract.
--	--	---