



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_38596
Title of the Manuscript:	Chronic Kidney Disease among Ghanaian HIV Individuals on HAART in the Ho Municipality: A single-center descriptive cross-sectional study
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	prevalence of CKD among Ghanaians living with HIV infection is reported to range from 3.7% in the Ashanti Region to 12.6% in the Upper-East Region. Is it possible to know the regimen of ART of these patients? As we know TDF containing regimen can lead to CKD Can you clearly explain how you enrolled the patients? Did you take all patients who came to the clinic in the 4 months? Were they some criteria you used? As you used a consent form I want to know if all patients gave their consent. If all did not participate to the study, how many withdrew? Did you find an explanation of why NVP is the first in your rank on inducing CKD? This is rare. If so, what could be the pathophysiology? There may be a bias in your study as you have more female than male.	The component drugs have been provided as suggested. Further information on inclusive and exclusive criteria have been provided at the study design and population section under Material and Methods. A revised discussion on the findings with the possible role of NVP have been provided in the "Discussion" section of the manuscript. Though the proportion of females enrolled in this study were more than males, a re-analysis of data shows that no significant gender difference in ART regimen selection nor the individual therapeutic agents was observed (Table 1). Furthermore the possibility of percentage bias due to unequal group size is eliminated with the testing of the probability that the difference in CKD prevalence being observed is due to chance or sampling (p-value). In this case probability is less than 0.05, therefore making the gender difference statistically significant.
Minor REVISION comments	NOT CLEAR IF PATIENTS CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY.	All patients consented to participating in the study and that information is provided at the Ethical consideration section under Materials and Methods.
Optional/General comments	NONE	