



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_42664
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation of Haematological Parameters with TNF- α and Interleukin (IL-6) in Seropositive HIV Patients on Highly Active Antiretroviral Therapy (HAART) and HAART Naïve patients.
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Despite being a normal process of the body's treatment of assaults of diverse origins (physical, microbial or chemical), inflammation can be injurious when chronic. Current paper seeks to determine the possible links between two inflammatory markers (TNF-α and IL-6) and various haematological parameters in HIV/AIDS patients and normal subjects. ABSTRACT I would suggest to authors: (1) the following form: background, methods, results, conclusion; (2) background: study context should be included followed by aim; (3) methods: to be revised, paying attention only to key tasks executed; all other details should be reserved for main text; (4) a rephrase of the aim as it understates the scope of the study; the study, apart from correlation of markers, did also compare the markers among three groups: treatment group, naïve group, and healthy group (5) title: similar observation as in the aim INTRODUCTION I think is good! There is enough background information to give context. However, as mentioned above, the aim is not clearly stated. METHODS Good! But am afraid more still needs to be done: (4) there is much and unnecessary details (lines 86-91) which contributes to the lengthiness of the paper, (5) there is no information about the statistical tests executed. I would suggest: (6) slashing off of lines 86 (from the second sentence), 87, 88, 89, 90, and 91; (7) justification of the choice and description of the statistical analyses carried out RESULTS Table 3: authors should harmonize the decimal points of rows 2, 8, and 14 DISCUSSION Discussions about the observed differences among the groups should not totally depart from the unequal repartition of the socio-demographic characteristics among the three groups.	1 and 2. the authors did not include background in the abstract because The author guidelines for science domain did not require authors to include background in their abstracts. (3) Some parts have been edited accordingly. 4. Aim has been rephrased. 6. The proposed lines have been slashed off. All have been rounded to one decimal place.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	There is good mastery of language, though manuscript needs to be carefully checked for few spotted grammatical errors.	No correction needed.
Optional/General comments	I think a study of this nature could be better designed by screening participants of various chronic conditions that could influence the outcome variables and their strict follow-up over an acceptable duration to monitor the evolution of these markers. Otherwise the scientificity of paper cannot be undermined.	