



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Blood Research &amp; Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_41710
Title of the Manuscript:	Haematological Correlate of anti-Phospholipid Syndrome in HIV Patients attending a Tertiary Health Institution in South-Western Nigeria
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Auto antibodies are usually initiated by some endogenous molecules or foreign bodies of either allergenic or microbial origins. They interpret “self” molecules as “foreign” and initiate a cascade of antibody-antigen reactions leading to various pathological conditions. Paper submission seeks to decipher the possible association between HIV infection and antiphospholipid syndrome caused by antiphospholipid antibodies. This is timely, considering the plethora of crisis experienced in some disease states including HIV/AIDS patients, most often secondary to viral infection. In my role as a scrooge, I have the following observations to make about the contents of the manuscript:</p> <p><b>ABSTRACT</b></p> <p>Key sections of paper are summarised, though with some adjustments to make. <b>(1)</b> Some key sections are not sufficiently summarized, making the abstract <b>lengthy</b>; this is the case of the “<b>methods</b>” and “<b>results</b>” sections. <b>(2)</b> The study was designed to correlate antiphospholipid antibodies with haematological parameters of HIV seropositive subjects and to compare these parameters between naïve and treated patients, and then between healthy subjects and treated patients. However, the latter is not included in the aim. <b>(3)</b> The title is relevant, but am afraid does not adequately fit within the scope of the study. As way out I will suggest:</p> <p><b>(1)</b> Revision of the “<b>methods</b>” and “<b>results</b>” sections of abstract;</p> <p><b>(2)</b> A one-sentence clear statement of the aim. The “<b>aim</b>” doesn't stand alone as a section but to be stated under the “<b>background</b>”</p> <p><b>(3)</b> A rephrase of the title with respect to the scope of the study.</p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <p>There is enough background information to give context to study, however, the observation here is same as <b>(2)</b> in abstract.</p> <p><b>METHODS</b></p> <p>The experimental techniques are very good and reliable. I am however concerned about the general approach of authors <b>(4)</b> my first concern is about the sample size calculation. The minimum sample size calculated is 79 and is based on a desired <b>effect size (level of significance)</b> which is fixed by the authors. It is unclear to me for which parameter the sample size is calculated. <b>(5)</b> I will differ somehow with authors on the design and statistical analyses executed as this could compromise the findings. First of all, the unequal distribution of subjects in groups and the absence of important group characteristics like age, sex raises questions as per the validity of findings. For a comparative statistics, <b>confounders</b> like <b>age, sex, and group numbers</b> are supposed to be balanced among other possible factors. I think what could be a valid finding in this design are the <b>correlation tests</b> since they are strictly limited to individual groups; otherwise authors should provide clarifications for points <b>(4) &amp; (5)</b></p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p><b>RESULTS</b></p> <p>Same observations as in “<b>methods</b>” section above</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION &amp; CONCLUSION</b></p> <p>Same remarks as in “<b>methods</b>” section. With no knowledge about the state of confounders, validity of findings is still to be demonstrated.</p> <p><b>REFERENCES</b></p> <p>Text is correctly referenced; however, most of the consulted articles date back beyond a decade. I will suggest to authors:</p> <p>Updates.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Language is good, but some grammatical revisions are required throughout the document	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Authors took a good initiative, but the grouping procedure needs to be revised	

Reviewer Details:

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