



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMMR_7449
Title of the Manuscript:	High frequency of non-B HIV-1 subtypes specific mutations at the protease gene among treatment-naïve HIV-1 infected individuals in Jos, Nigeria
Type of the 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	<p>When (and which) were PI's introduced in Nigeria (and which ones)? Is it possible that some patients were infected with drug-resistant strains from treated patients? The authors should comment on this.</p> <p>Besides protease, the authors also amplified and sequenced a part of the RT gene (as their PCR fragment is approx. 1000 nt). Did they analyse this RT fragment for additional drug-resistance mutations against RT-inhibitors?</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Line 57-58: should read: "was measured <u>at the</u> same day of the blood draw using <u>a</u> Partec..."</p> <p>In general: English usage should be carefully examined throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>This paper investigates the naturally occurring protease resistance mutations in 100 HIV-1 isolates circulating in Nigeria. It is well written and the results are clearly presented.</p> <p>The Materials & methods are suitable and described in sufficient detail to reproduce the experiments described.</p> <p>Results & discussion: The data are well controlled and robust. The Discussion and conclusions are based on actual facts and figures. Appropriate statistical analysis has been done to describe patient characteristics? The conclusions are supported by the data. The references cited relevant and adequate.</p>	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer