



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">Title too lengthy and needs to be re-structured. Authors should start by slashing off “<i>seropositive</i>” because being “<i>HIV patient on antiretroviral</i>” is already being “<i>seropositive</i>”.Abstract should be thoroughly revised at the level of sentence structure and punctuation especially in its result and conclusion section.Introduction? It has not been titled. Information in this section is flawed due to inappropriate sentence structures, punctuations and some minor orthographic errors.Materials & methods: conflicting information as to the duration of drug treatment. In abstract it is 6 months while under “<i>study population and procedure</i>”, it is >3 months. It could be 4, 5, 6, 1000 months? Maybe authors included in their study only patients who have been on treatment for at least 6 months. Please also check this section for grammar. The second paragraph under “<i>consideration</i>” should rather find its self under “<i>study population and procedure</i>”Results: demographic data seems problematic; no clear correlation between frequencies and percentages. Besides, the sub-sections “<i>educational status, occupation of participants, income in Naira</i>” each recorded less than the 100 participants stated in the sample size. Authors should precise if there were fall-outs. The bar chart on CD4 counts displays 2 problematic ranges: 200-500 & >200. Authors should redress this.Discussion: discussion should be more in-depth. For example, just saying persistent activation of TNF-α is not sufficient. TNF-α is an inflammatory marker and authors should do more search on the possible synergistic or individual contribution of the various culprit factors: <i>HIV, opportunistic infections and probably antiretroviral</i> drugs in the initiation of the inflammatory process. This also has influence on the immunological status of patients.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	7. Conclusion: the conclusion of your <i>abstract</i> should be an excerpt of the <i>general conclusion</i> . Please check this section because the two are somewhat divergent in a few aspects. Authors recommended boosting of the immune system in the abstract section. Are they acknowledging some pitfalls in the current treatment method of HIV/AIDS that might have contributed to the results at hand? The pitfalls should be discussed and the exact remedies projected.	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Manuscript should be entirely revised for grammatical and some minor orthographic errors.	
Optional/General comments	1. The information in the bar charts could better be represented in a table for more convenience of reading and space.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Tabé Franklin Nyenty</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department Of Biomedical Sciences, University Of Ngaoundere,Cameroon</i>