



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_36037
Title of the Manuscript:	Profile of CD4, Tumor necrosis factor alpha, Hematological parameters and prevalence of hematological cytopenia in HIV seropositive patients on Anti-retroviral therapy in university of port Harcourt teaching hospital.
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	In Study Population and Procedure, recommend that an explanation is provided why fewer than 100 patients are included/reported in Table 2. The authors report that 100 patients were recruited, but do not provide an explanation why less than 100 are provided in the results, and this should be explained.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>There are multiple spelling and grammatical errors that should be addressed. Unfortunately line numbers were not included in the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Aims, "AR" should be spelled out, and with (ART) for future use in the paper. 2. Use ART throughout (HAART was used in one instance). 3. In Results: the 5th line should use "were" instead of "was". 4. In Fig 1, the > 200 should be changed to "< 200" (to reflect less than 200). 5. Multiple other noun-verb agreement issues, punctuation, and misspelling throughout. However, without line numbers, I am unable to characterize all of them here. <p>In the Discussion, the paper would have more interesting results if an analysis of leucopenia by the CD4 count divisions were provided. For example, was there a statistically significant higher percent of leucopenia in those patients with CD4 less than 200 vs. the other groups? Or did this not impact the leucopenia.</p> <p>In the Discussion, recommend the same analysis for TNF alpha by CD4 counts.</p> <p>Recommend providing more background in the discussion why pathogenic role TNF alpha has on HIV patients, in order to better highlight the significance of the result of elevated TNF alpha in this study.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mary J. Burgess
Department, University & Country	University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, USA