



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_14579
Title of the Manuscript:	GASTROINTESTINAL HELMINTH INFECTIONS IN HIV SEROPOSITIVE PATIENTS IN DSCHANG, CAMEROON
Type of the 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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	Generally: The manuscript is very important in its field of study Title: should be corrected as "GASTROINTESTINAL HELMINTH INFECTIONS IN HIV SEROPOSITIVE AND SERONEGATIVE PATIENTS IN DSCHANG, CAMEROON" Introduction: well done but there are a lot of grammar errors that should be corrected throughout the manuscript. Methods: The method part is not clear 1. Why the authors took stool sample only from 8am to 12am? 2. What were the inclusions and exclusions criteria's to select the patients for stool diagnosis? Because sometimes people who were taking/under taking antiparasitic disease may dilute the positive results as a result, negative results will be increased. 3. The HIV test algorism might have some problem. What will happen if determine is positive and confirmatory (IMMUNOCOMB II) test is negative? I think a third tiebreaker test is needed	-We agree and it is highlighted in the manuscript 1.We agree and the reason is highlighted in the manuscript 2. We agree and we added 3. We agree and it is highlighted in the manuscript



SDI Review Form 1.6

	4. Clearly state about the Willis concentration techniques and MC Master Technique? What is the principle of each test Result: generally well stated but some corrections 1. the statements from line number 106-109 “There were 107 HIV positives and 463 HIV negatives. The HIV positives comprised 32 (29.9%) males and 75 (70.1%) females with a mean ($\pm$ SD) of 38.1 ($\pm$13.5) years. Among HIV negatives, 112 (24.2%) were males and 351 (75.8%) were females with a mean ($\pm$ SD) age of 33.6 ($\pm$17) years.” are not a demographic data rather a prevalence or are not in the right place. So, include in the prevalence section. Discussion part: generally well discussed nut some corrections 1. In line number 155 “ do you believe that the prevalence difference of yours from the Wabo Poné <i>et al.</i> study is due to behavioral and environmental differences since both are done in the same geographical area and the previous one is done recently before 2 years? And what significance behavioral and environmental differences are there to say so? 2. Line number 161-162 Do you believe that the low species specific rates recorded in you study may be due to public awareness and improvement of environmental sanitation. I hope the awareness of the people do not affect the species specific rates of the geohelminths rather the environmental factors such as temperature, humidity rain fall, and altitude. Since these factors affect the egg maturation of geohelminths.	4.We agree and stated it 1.We agree and changed it 1.We agree and it is more explained in the text 2.Yes because if the population is aware of hygienic practices it could affect the rate of infection.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3. Line number 187-191 You stated that “The intensity difference of you study from the Modjarrah <i>et al.</i> is due to method difference.” Do believe that? Which method is more sensitive/ appropriate to determine the intensity? Conclusion: <i>should be rewritten</i> Although our study was limited by the number of stool samples analyzed per person, HIV positive individuals are less likely to have gastrointestinal helminths rather than HIV negative.	3. Kato katz used by Modjarrah <i>et al</i> is more sensitive We agree and it is highlighted in the manuscript
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are some grammar correction which should be corrected before publication throughout the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please clarify the ethical issues if any	