



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/ISRR/1897
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF DIABETES MELLITUS, HYPERTENSION AND LIPODYSTROPHY IN HAART RECEIVING HIV PATIENTS IN SOUTHERN ETHIOPIA.

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	The issue of HIV and HAART related lipodystrophy and related pathophysiologic changes which may be linked to CV risk is is very important. The authors seek to assess factors related to DM and HTN in HIV patients. The results are interesting, however there are several gaos and potential shortcomings in the manuscript that should be addressed to allow appropriate assessment of the findings.	
Specific comments:		
Title and abstract		
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)		
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?		
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	1- Why this this hospital chosen? How representative is the chosen population to HIV patients in general? 2- How was the sample size chosen? What is the power of the analyses? This is important to note especially given the low numbers of subjects with DM and HTN. The limitations of the analyses and results related to these low numbers should be acknowledged and discussed. 3- Were the instruments used to assess body fat distribution and changes validated? If so this should be noted. If not, this should be acknowledged as a limitation and discussed.	This was a short term study. This hospital was chosen because it caters to a majority of the population in that area. The sample size was chosen based on the prevalence of lipodystrophy in a study by Mutimura which was 32%. This value was fed into the statistical formula to determine the sample size. The low number of DM and HTN patients are comparable to their prevalence in other Ethiopian studies. Also a single fasting glucose test to determine prevalence of DM could have influenced the results. Validated skin callipers were used to assess body fat distribution.



SDI Review Form 1.5

	4- A SBP of 140 is usually used to define HTN. Why was 120 used? This must be justified and explained. Even if a reasonable explanation can be provided to justify the use of 120, an analysis using a cut point of 140 would seem appropriate to include also. 5- Single measures of glucose are usually not adequate to diagnose DM. The limitation of this should be acknowledged and discussed. 6- How were the variables included in the models chosen? 7- The limitations in the qualitative self-assessment of physical activity should be acknowledged. 8- The authors state that there was no association with type of therapy, but these results are not presented. The types of medications and frequency should also be described.	Sorry, this was a typing error in the final draft which went unnoticed. Corrections are made in the manuscript quoting the appropriate references used. This limitation has been discussed. Independent variables showing significant association ($p=0.05$) during bivariate analysis were fed into multivariate models to control for confounding variables and analyzed using multivariate logistic regression. This statement has been removed since association with type of therapy is not within the scope of the study.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.5

Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)		
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?		
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)		
References		