

Editor's Comment:

Thank you for submitting your manuscript " Prevalence of Renal dysfunction and its relationship to CD4 and TNF alpha of HIV positive individuals on Anti-retroviral Therapy in Port Harcourt." to Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences . Following careful consideration by the journal's editorial board and a group of expert reviewers,

I regret to inform you that we are unable to accept your submission.

I am including the reviewer comments in this email for your reference. I hope you find this information helpful for submission at another journal, and we hope to see more of your work in the future.

Reviewer 1#

1. Authors did not reply to my former concern on the conclusion. This study is cross sectional study and the authors did not observe the relation between decline of renal function and value of TNFa or CD4. Therefore it is not possible to conclude that CD4 can predict the renal dysfunction.
2. Table 2 numbers of cohort are not correct. Renal dysfunction group N=45 or 51? When the sum of each age group is calculated, N=45 but Gender F=47 and M=4. So as normal renal function group.
3. In introduction, the authors mentioned the renotoxicity of tenofovir which was not investigated in the current study. The authors should delete this part.

Reviewer 2#

This is a cross-sectional study investigating the association between renal function staging and immunological markers and cytokines. It is not an innovative study, yet it has its scientific contributions.

However, despite previous suggestions, the text has not been corrected. It is, however, a problem of language, not technical-scientific. In this respect, it is of the utmost importance that the manuscript be reviewed by a native English speaker.

With regard to the technical-scientific aspect, the introduction is very extensive, and apparently larger than the discussion of the study itself. This violates the basic premises of scientific writing. The method was copied from a previous suggestion, rather than using the suggestion as a guide for its rewriting. Indeed, in places where it was requested to be expanded or to provide more information, nothing was done.

The results are "thrown" randomly, without objectivity or sequential nexus. Statistical analysis is precarious for data of such relevance. Linear regression analysis and simple difference between groups, instead of exploring the data, creating logistic regression models, in order to identify a relevant predictor model.

The discussion is brief, and in some aspects it seems to repeat what was presented in the results. There is no clear discussion of the findings, raising ideas or confronting ideas. The conclusion follows in the same vein.

The raw material of the study is rich, but very poorly worked, causing loss of its technical-scientific value.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Amr Ahmed El-Arabey
Pharmacology & Toxicology Department, Al-Azhar University, Egypt & University of Science and Technology of China (USTC), China