



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discussion is rather fair and needs widening. 	Tried to widen it.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Microscopic identification of the parasites is not in the correct place, it should be after the tables in the results and discussion as a figure. 2. The material and methods are thorough described. 3. It is well documented that PCR is a good method for detecting Coccidian Parasites. Therefore, this should be stated as a recommendation for further study. 	<p>It was left as part of the appendix.</p> <p>....a wider array of laboratory diagnostic tools like polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and larger sample size in order to determine the scale of diarrheal diseases in HIV patients in the region.</p>
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction is adequate. 2. The References are OK 	Thank you but I again tried to rebuild the Introduction slightly please read through again.