



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_45427
Title of the Manuscript:	VARIATIONS IN ELECTROLYTE AND SALIVARY AMYLASE (PTYALIN) LEVELS IN HIV-POSITIVE SUBJECTS
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	The title clearly reflects the focus of the study. It is concise and formatted in in the form of a statement. Comments on the abstract The abstract is well written. It's good that the author stated how statistical analysis was performed on sampled variables, and comparisons made between groups. However it can further be improved by paying attention to the following- Though the major findings of the study are indicated, their implications have not been presented. Although the recommendations are given, the conclusion is missing.	Effected as pointed in abstract. Additions are now marked in yellow.
Minor REVISION comments	Comments on the Introduction It is good that the introduction is directly related to the title/topic. The author is also commended for sufficiently describing the subject being researched by first indicating the knowledge gap clearly. One minor comment is that although the aim of the study is given, it can be appreciated if the specific objectives are also stated in relation to the topic. Otherwise the manuscript is coherent and they adhere to logical development from theory to application.	Effected. Specific objectives now added to the end of introduction. Thank you for the commendations
Optional/General comments	Comments on Methodology - It is good that the research design used is appropriate. However, the author is required to fully describe and justify it. - The study population is clearly identified. Another positive remark is that the sample size is adequate and sampling procedure are fully described. However, there seems to be no mention of the exclusion criteria. Materials and methods used for data collection are clearly stated but they also need to be sufficiently justified. Comments on findings, discussion and conclusion - Findings merely stated, not explained in relation to the objectives and research questions. - The conclusions are derived from findings, and the recommendations are clear. It is good that the recommendations are derived from the conclusion and findings- that further studies be carried out with anti-retroviral drugs to establish facts on whether such drugs alleviate these complications resulting from electrolyte depletion on short and long term bases in HIV sufferers.	Before now, inclusion and exclusion criteria were added. See them in the section on "Selection of subjects for participation"

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	