



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 fails to meet an acceptable level.. The authors were previously advised to correct grammatical errors. Corrections were needed not only to the cited errors, not all of which were properly corrected. More concerning is the loose manner with which several statements are made. For example "Patients did not know what group they were assigned to." supposedly means "Patients were unaware at the time of volunteering as to which group they were to be randomly assigned."</p> <p>Of more scientific concern, is the loose use of the term "significant." It is clearly wrong to state in Table 4 that "The physical functioning showed significant improvements in all groups" when the values for group 1 were 60.00 +/- 16.58 versus 63.88 +/- 17.33, with a statistically insignificant Difference of 3.89 +/- 7.23. The authors state that they use ANOVA to determine statistical significance, but no actual calculations are provided for the results in the various Tables or provided in support the several statements and conclusions drawn within the text. Another example is the statement under Table 1 that group 3 had an increase in BMI, when the difference was 0.05 +/- 0.15 (21.32 vs 21.37). This statement is not scientifically justified. Nor is it acceptable to conclude a decrease in BMI of -0.21 +/- 0.36 in group 1. Similarly, with regards to statements regarding the Mental Health scores in group 1 in Table 5. ANOVA calculations will likely show many of the recorded Differences as being statistically insignificant and it is inappropriate to suggest otherwise. The phrase "considerably lower" in group 1 in Table 3 when the difference has a Standard Deviation bigger than the number itself, is nondescript and not really meaningful.</p> <p>The results from the SF-36 questionnaire are placed into 3 categories, represented in Tables 4, 5 and 6, as "Mean Physical functioning scores;" Mean General Mental Health scores;" and Mean General Health Perception" The selection of questions assigned to each category is not defined. Nor is it clear if pain is included in one or more categories.</p> <p>Another scientific limitation is that the Discussion does not specifically address the details of the author's own study. The Discussion is more of a summary of data of other studies. Moreover, the statements relating to Yoga from other studies are more positive than the results of the present study. The Discussion would be more meaningful if it provided a comparison of the author's study with prior published studies.</p>	



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

As previously commented, the References do not follow a consistent format. For examples, capitals are only sometime used for the first letter in the Titles of journals.

In summary, the original paper had some modest value in identifying an unmet need in the healthcare of HIV infected individuals. The first revision of the paper only partially addressed several deficiencies in the original paper. Moreover, there was a major error in the data presented in Table 3 with regards to the patients in group 2. **The current second revision of the paper lacks a sound statistical** evaluation of the data and fails to objectively discuss the results in relationship to prior related studies. In my opinion, the paper needs to be critically rewritten to avoid misleading statements and erroneous conclusions. Further attempts at minor modifications would seemingly be insufficient to create a meaningful and instructive research article.

For my Objective Evaluation I would advise 4. In other words, this paper should be rejected and not simply partially revised. Including wrong data in Table in the first revision was probably grounds for rejection. The second revision has introduced a new basis of serious criticism, in the loose references to statistical significance and the lack of an objective Discussion of the data as presented.

Reviewer Details:

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