



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_42404
Title of the Manuscript:	Exercise & Yoga as an intervention for enhancing subjective wellbeing in HIV-positive individuals
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	<p>This paper offers useful information supporting the use of either exercise and yoga as adjunct therapy in HIV infected patients. The paper is not presently acceptable for publication, however, because of numerous grammatical errors as well as the need for additional clarifications and some minor restructuring of parts of the paper.</p> <p>The paper should be expertly edited to remove the many grammatical irregularities, including the overuse of “&” for the word “and.” There is also the frequent mistaking of singular versus plural subjects in the use of verbs. Several statements lack precision and appear redundant.</p> <p>The paper could also be improved by better summarizing the earlier related studies in the Introduction including the studies cited in references. The extent to which the present paper confirms or differs in any way with the prior published studies can then be better specified.</p> <p>The exercise and yoga programs are presented as an alternative to medical care. The programs are more likely to have been an addition to regular medical care. This should be clarified. The issue of whether evaluations were performed in a double blinded manner or with the knowledge of the persons performing the evaluation should be stated. Did the participants in the groups respond uniformly or were there both responders and non-responders in the different groups? This is relevant since exercise is viewed as being detrimental to some patients, for example those with the chronic fatigue syndrome. Specifically, were there any examples of deletions responses among the patients in the exercise group? it would also be interesting to note whether the apparent benefits were sustained during the follow-up six week. While not necessary for this paper, were there any documented laboratory changes in the three groups of patients as a result of the trial?</p> <p>The “target heart rate” should be stated under the Procedure section of Methodology and not left for the Discussion. The Methodology section describes “the lower the score the more disability,” yet the Tables generally show an increase in scores. This need to be clarified. Changes in the quality of sleep would have provided an additional useful measure of wellness.</p> <p>Inferences (interpretations) are included beneath each Table in the Results. The inferences would probably be better placed in the discussion. There is no discussion regarding possible mechanisms of the apparent beneficial efforts. Ideally, the authors could indicate whether the study has led to a change in medical practice at their institution or whether follow-up studies are underway.</p> <p>In conclusion, the paper has interesting data. There is, however, a need for major corrections in the grammar of the paper with more precise statements. The authors should clarify the uncertainties mentioned in this review and discuss the paper within the context of earlier similar studies.</p>	<p>Thank you for reviewing our article and giving us your valuable inputs. We have made the necessary changes as per the comments.</p> <p>Patients with CD4< 200 cells/mm³ were excluded from the study and also the intensity of exercises were moderate with a slow, rhythmic speed. There were no patient deletions.</p> <p>We were unable to document the laboratory changes after the trial.</p> <p>To score SF-36, the response to a question is graded in a scale of 0-100, the higher scores depicted in the Tables indicate improvement in the parameters measured over the period of 6 weeks.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous Reviewer, Reviewer preferred to be anonymous.
Department, University & Country	