



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_33816
Title of the Manuscript:	Glucose-6-Phosphate Dehydrogenase Deficiency in Individuals Infected with Human Immunodeficiency Virus at the Aminu Kano Teaching Hospital Kano, North 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Please provide a description of your statistics in the method section. Please indicate in your discussion that you could not ascertain from your study whether the higher level of G6PD deficiency in people living with HIV/AIDS was preexisting before the infection or was a consequence of the infection. Figure one is not clear. As you have already indicated the cut off values for deficiency, it might be better for you to indicate the proportion of people with and without deficiency in the plot. Expand tables 2 and 3 to include the various HIV populations and the control group you studied. Comment on the distribution of the HIV and control participants within the 31 – 40 years bracket, which account for nearly 50% of your sample size. The interpretation of your data significance in table 4 is not clear. Your description of male to female ratio in G6PD deficiency is not clear and consistent.	Statistical analysis description has now been included. Comment on whether the higher level of G6PD deficiency in people living with HIV/AIDS was preexisting before the infection or was a consequence of the infection has now been included in the discussion. The figure has been redone showing distribution of G-6-PD deficient individuals and G-6-PD normal individuals in all groups The two tables have been expanded to reflect all study groups and control group. Distribution of study population in terms of age particularly the 31-40 years bracket is discussed in the discussion section Data significance of table 4 has been included in the discussion section, however the parameters of interest are CD4 count, haemoglobin, RBC and PCV. PCV and haemoglobin variation in the study groups has been elucidated in figures 2 and 3. PCV which have already been reflected in figures 2 and 3.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Stick to one abbreviation for Glucose 6 Phosphate Dehydrogenase: G6PD or G-6-PD? Check for grammatical errors throughout the text. Split the first sentence of the abstract into two for clarity. CD4 is not an immunological marker of HIV infection. Please correct the statement in the abstract and any other place it appears in the manuscript. NOTE: CD4 count in an immunological marker used to monitor disease progression in people living with HIV/AIDS. You should define a term once in the manuscript. G-6-PD was defined twice. Table 4.1 should be Table 5.	Correction has been effected. G-6-PD Correction has been effected Correction has been effected Correction noted and effected. Correction noted and effected Correction noted and effected.
Optional/General comments		