



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMMR_15959
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiology of Coccidian Parasites in HIV Patients of Northern Uganda
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	<p>If other Coccidian species were tested for, they should be included in Table 2, as it is informative even if the prevalence is very low or even 0.</p> <p>The titles of the tables should be improved. For example, the title for Table 2 could be "Coccidian species prevalence in HIV patients. Furthermore, Tables 1-3 could be combined into one table titled something along the lines of "Descriptive statistics of the study population." The table should also include the total proportion of people in each category rather than only the proportion of people in each category with coccidian parasites.</p> <p>I strongly recommend that a statistical test be used for the results presented in Table 3 to determine whether or not the differences are statistically significant.</p> <p>I strongly recommend that the analysis include an adjusted logistic regression with coccidian parasites (yes/no) as the outcome, rather than only showing a frequency table.</p> <p>It is important to note in the discussion that you have very likely overestimated the Coccidian parasite prevalence in the HIV infected population because an inclusion criteria was diarrhoea.</p>	<p>Cyclospora was tested though no prevalence; now included</p> <p>Title was adjusted and tables re-designed.</p> <p>Total populations were included.</p> <p>Statistical analysis was carried out.</p> <p>Table re-adjusted</p> <p>Control test was left out in the previous write up however, it has been included.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Table 2 is missing the frequency of participants with C. parvum.	Corrected and re-tuned
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There some typos (mostly missing words) in this article that should be corrected.	