



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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
New title:	HIV-positive individuals: Exercise, Yoga and Quality of life
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The paper still contains grammatical errors which impair the fluent reading of the paper. For example, the 3rd sentence in the Abstract Background; the second and fourth sentences in the Abstract Methodology; the first sentence in Abstract Results. Other grammatical errors occur throughout the text. There is also the unnecessary use of capital letters in words within sentences. The word "measured" on line 75 is superscript. The word "both" on line 94 should be positioned before the word "mental" rather than at the end of the sentence.</p> <p>It is still not clearly stated whether the exercise was an adjunct to or an alternative to medical care, including the routine use of anti-retrovirals. The meaning of the term "single blinded" in the Methodology is not explained. The "target heart rate" is not defined in the Procedure (Line 100).</p> <p>The + sign used with one exception in Table 1 and in many of the other Tables should presumably be +/- . It is not indicated whether it is Standard Error (SE) or Standard Deviation (SD). It is also not clear if the + assigned to the Difference is derived from a summation of separate calculations performed on each individual within the three groups or from a comparison of mean values. The Difference value 0.064 in Group 3, should presumably be 0.05. The number 2 in referring to BMI (kg/m²) should be a superscript. The statistical significance of the asterisk for the values -0.21 and 0.56 in Table 1 and with several of the values in other Tables is not clear. Was significance determined using both ANOVA and Chi Square analysis?</p> <p>The Value *-6.83 for the Difference in mean HAS Score in Group 2 in Table 3, is seemingly a major error. Possibly it is meant to be -3.17. Alternately, the stated Baseline value for Group 2 may be in error.</p> <p>The Discussion regarding Table 1 should emphasize that the BMI was actually reduced in Group 1, in contrast to Groups 2 and 3, with a greater benefit seen in Group 2.</p> <p>Although it is stated on Line 119 that there was an additional follow up of 6 weeks and that patients "responded uniformly to the treatment" no actual data are provided to substantiate the sustained improvement. Nor is it clear whether there were any non-responders to the exercise and yoga programs. It would have been of interest if the authors had described the currently used exercise program within their institution and whether it follows the protocol outlined in this paper.</p> <p>The formatting of the References should be uniform as required by the Journal.</p> <p>In summary, the article is still in need of major corrections, including the use of correct grammar. Clarification of the Tables and especially of the Results of group 2 in Table 3 is essential. It should be clearly stated that the study is an adjunct to normal</p>	



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

medical care rather than an alternative to medical care. The meaning of the study being single-blinded should also be clarified. The Introduction and Discussion still do not clearly distinguish the conclusions specifically based upon this study from the conclusions resulting from other studies. This omission diminishes the value of this paper as an independent, data-based study. The useful message of a well-written paper would be that most and quite possibly all HIV patients can benefit from an exercise program and that the present study has led to the incorporation of exercise into their institutional care of HIV infected patients. This message is not sufficiently well presented with well analyzed data to presently warrant publication. Major revisions or outright rejection is recommended.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>W John Martin</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Institute of Progressive Medicine, USA</i>