



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	

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>)

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	From lines# 65 to 67, you mentioned swelling of the salivary gland in HIV patients which might lead to changing in the amount of salivary composition, so you should have selected HIV patients with the swelling of the salivary gland. In your study, you did not use this condition but you found the changing in the amounts of amylase and electrolytes in HIV patients' salivary. And then you concluded your results that the levels of chemicals in HIV patients' salivary represented their amounts in blood which are not recently applicable. These chemicals are still necessary to be measured from blood sample, not saliva. And because HIV is transmitted by all patients' blood and secretions including saliva, the use of saliva for laboratory testing is not accepted. If you kept on your hypothesis and selected HIV patients with the swelling of salivary gland, your results might be clinically valuable for explaining why HIV patients had the swelling of their salivary gland.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Veeravan Lekskulchai</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand</i>