



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b><u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>2014_BJMMR_15959</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Epidemiology of Coccidian Parasites in HIV Patients of Northern Uganda</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>ABSTRACT</b> Write "ZN" in full</p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b> <u>Line 24.</u> It will be suitable for time and purpose to place citation in the first sentence instead of keeping the reader in suspense till the second sentence.eg "In a recent study in Ethiopia...(ref.)".The same is applicable to line 30.</p> <p><b>METHODS</b> It will also be suitable to describe the study area in terms of geographical location, people of the area, their common habit that may favour faecal-oral transmission of pathogens, etc. Who confirmed the subjects HIV positive? You or based on hospital record? Describe methodology scientifically and logically. How did you collect data and specimen from children? Considering their age, did you seek their consent directly or indirectly from their parents/Guardians? <u>Line 64.</u> Do you mean "Formal ether" or "formalin ether"? <u>Line 65.</u> Write ZN in full. How did you weigh accurately the 2g diarrhoea stool sample added to centrifuge tube? What is the volume of centrifuge tube that contained two gram of stool? Was there ethical approval? If any, write it under this section.</p>	<p><b>Ziehl-Neelsen</b></p> <p>It has been corrected please</p> <p>All has been corrected in the methodology in agreement with the reviewer.</p> <p>Formol ether</p> <p>2mg not 2g corrected</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p><b>RESULT</b></p> <p>Separate result from discussion. put tables on separate pages immediately after result.</p> <p>There is inconsistency in table 2. You did not record the frequency for <i>C.parvum</i> but you noted the percentage.</p> <p>There is need to include total. On table 3,the total number of infected subjects according to age group does not correspond with the stated number in table 1.</p> <p>Restructure and also fine-tune table three. The entire result section needs rewriting.</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION</b></p> <p><b>Line 101.</b> You wrote "<b>Further analysis showed ...</b>".Cross check.</p> <p><b>Line 109 and 110.</b>You pointed out that consumption of raw bore hole water was a major risk factor for coccidian parasites. How will you correlate raw bore hole water with coccidian parasites?</p> <p>Delete lines 149 through 163.</p> <p>Cut and paste lines <b>167-176 on methods section. lines 272 through 305 are not needed.</b></p> <p><b>If there are any ethical issues, please clarify.</b></p>	<p>All tables were re-designed and results re-written in agreement with the reviewer.</p> <p>Cross checked and corrected.</p> <p>Discussion was corrected</p> <p>Deleted</p> <p>Ethical considerations were included.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		