



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_26088
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the impact of Antiretroviral Therapy on CD4, Hemoglobin level and Weight in HIV Infected Children (0-15 Years) residing in Nkambe, North West Region, Cameroon
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	I think the authors had attempted to reflect the title of the article in the text. It was a good trial considering the burden of HIV in the developing nations, especially among children. My concern is on the methodology and results based on population and choice of statistical tests. In line 69; 130 children suppose to be the sample. Sample is drawn from a population. What is the population of the children in the hospital? Sample technique was not state. In line 87, the authors should state the type of T-test used. In line 113, table 2, the lower ranges of CD4+ cell count at baseline and after initiation of therapy should be reconsidered. The authors may need to explain why T – test was employed to obtain p-value in line 121, table 4, for variables in frequency and percentages. In lines 129 and 130, the authors stated that there was a correlation..., referring to table 5. This table does not show any correlation statistic. The T – test used in that table is not appropriate. T – test is a parametric statistical test and should be used as such. Association will be more appropriate than relation in table 7, line 151.	line 69; Sample was calculated using Lorenz formula with an HIV prevalence of 9.3% in children below 15 year line 87, Independent-Samples T-test was used. line 113, table 2, we had 30 children with decrease CD4 after intervention and the CD4 of 34 is one of the decrease cases line 121 we used chi square and not T – test it was a typographical error on table 4 lines 129 and 130. Table 5 is referring to the explanation before line 129 and 130 and not the correlation. It has been corrected. Table 5. is chi square and not T – test it was a typographical error line 151 relation has been replaced with Association.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 43, “serve” should be “serves”. In line 67, including those below one year, as regards consent? In line 72, “were” is a better option than “was” for inclusion criteria. In line 95 “for” instead of “to”. In line 159, the hyphen (-) should be deleted. In lines 162 – 164, the authors compared their study with other studies; they should be able to tell the readers where these other studies were conducted, i.e. references 14, 16, and 6. In line 166, “that” should be replaced with “than”. (Patel et al., 2012) in lines 216 & 217 is a new style of referencing. The authors should go through the list of	Line 43: Corrected on line 63 and not 43 Line 67: only for the children above 10 years line 72, corrected to “were” line 95 corrected to “for” line 159, did not see the hyphen lines 162 – 164, places included 14, 16, and 6. line 166, corrected to “than”. (Patel et al., 2012) in lines 216 & 217 italic removed from the year. reference 25, corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	reference, see reference 25, the dating.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors may need to consult a statistician.	Correlation has been done presently using Pearson' correlation by year of intervention.