



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 manuscript is interesting. However, it has several and serious limitations that should be recognized by the authors in the discussion. It could be significantly improved after major revision.	
Specific comments:		
Title and abstract	In the abstract conclusions are lacking and should be included	Conclusions have been included
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	The objective of the study is not original. However, it has a clinical importance.	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	References should be updated.	Have been updated
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)	A control group (HIV-infected subjects not receiving HAART) is lacking and should be included. Definition of hypertension and diabetes mellitus should be reviewed and updated according to the most recent clinical guidelines. Type of HAART (with or without PI) and smoking habit should be included in multivariate analysis.	It is not ethically recommended to have a control group not receiving adequate and ethically approved treatment for any disease. However comparisons could have been made between HAART regimens but this is beyond the scope of the current study. Definitions of DM and HTN have been updated.
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?)	Based on the above reported limitations of the study, the results are not convincing. Statistical analysis (multivariate analysis) should include also type of HAART and smoking habit and the related results should be properly discussed. References should be reviewed and updated.	Investigating the type of HAART regimen is beyond the scope of the study. Since smoking was observed only in 1% of the subjects, it was excluded in multivariate analysis.
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No	
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)	Conclusions are not convincing. Data should be carefully reviewed according to the above reported remarks and properly discussed and reported in the conclusions.	An attempt has been made and revisions included
References		