



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_18965
Title of the Manuscript:	SEROPREVALENCE OF SYPHILIS IN HIV POSITIVE INDIVIDUALS ATTENDING IMMUNO SUPPRESSED SYNDROME CLINIC AT INTERNATIONAL HOSPITAL KAMPALA
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>TITLE</p> <p>The HIV acronym used in the title should be written in full. The study location was not properly stated in the title in that it does not reflect the country where the study was carried out i.e. Uganda. In view of this fact I suggest the title be changed to read: “,Seroprevalence of Syphilis in Human Immunodeficiency Virus positive individuals attending Immune suppressed syndrome clinic at International Hospital, Kampala Uganda”.</p>	<p>HIV acronym edited</p> <p>Title revised to reflect the country</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>Two hundred and eighty four words were used for the unstructured abstract. A brief introductory statement was made in Line 6-8. “This study enrolled 150 (104 females and 46 males) respondents....” .instead of ‘This study enrolled 150 (104 females and 46 males) were males.....’</p> <p>The rational for the 6months period of the study was not given, why was it not extended to 12months? The author did not state the objective of the study in the abstract. The level of significance should also be stated. The result of the study addressed its objective to determine the seroprevalence of syphilis and explored the factors associated with its infection among HIV</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>positive individuals. Although; the conclusion was vague and not succinctly presented the author made a useful recommendation.</p> <p>KEY WORDS</p> <p>The acronyms TPHA, RPR should be written in full without exceeding 6 words or otherwise removed and place in the body of the text. The acronym STD is not used again instead STI should replace it. It should not necessarily be a key word. The key word ISS (immune suppressed Syndrome) should have been included instead of STD.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>The introduction was able to give the burden of</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>HIV and active syphilis prevalence in sub Saharan Africa and South East Asia. The author should interrogate the total number of people infected with HIV globally with the sub Saharan Africa like Uganda and then state the seroprevalence of syphilis in each of this region among HIV patients.</p> <p>The sentences in Lines 30-31 and 35-38, should be referenced. In Line 42-44; the author should instead of emphasizing sub Saharan Africa like Ethiopia explore the socio-economic impact of STI (D) in Uganda. Reference 5 should come before reference 6 in line 44-46. Though line 42-46 appear to have justify the study; the reference number 6 was about Ethiopia and not Uganda, so it is not justifying the reason for the study in</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Uganda. Proper justification should be made for this study. In the same vein, although Line 47-50 spoke about the broad objective for the study, the author should elucidate the specific objectives as well.</p> <p>METHODOLOGY</p> <p>The author should explain the rational for using a higher prevalence of syphilis than the one in Ethiopia (Line 59-62).. If the reason was based on the fact that HIV prevalence in Uganda was times 3 that of Ethiopia, the seroprevalence to be used should have been 3 times of the one found in Uganda which should have given us $9.8 \times 3 = 29.4$. The sample size if calculated based on this should</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>have given us 320 respondents instead of 150 used for this study.</p> <p>RESULTS</p> <p>In Line 82 –The title of the figure 1 should have been more appropriate as Algorithm for HIV screening and confirmatory test in Uganda instead of the one used. In Line 101 –figure 1 was referred to was not appropriate for the sentence. It should be deleted leaving only table 1. Generally, the title of a table should be at the top it while that of a figure should be below the figure .This was not adhered to because some table like Table 2 has its title below while figure 2 (line112) has its title below. Furthermore, In Table 1 the sum of % of various occupations was 77.9%. not up to 100%.</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>The sum of % for the nature of marriage was greater than 100.1 % and not 100%.</p> <p>DICUSSION</p> <p>The author based his/her discussion on only 3 studies. More literature searches should be made to be able to have a robust discussion</p> <p>CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>The statement on line 164-165 on sensitization among the youths is misplaced as the study have not shown why special focus is required about this group. The age range for the study population was 15-63.</p> <p>REFERENCE</p> <p>The author seems to have conformed to the</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Vancouver Reference Style to a limited extent.</p> <p>However, reference style used was not consistent as Havard was used in line 81 havard instead of the Vancouver method. References 10 and 11 was not well stated as it does not include authors names, title of the study, date and time it was accessed.</p> <p>To conclude, I believe that when the uthor make the corrections as suggested he/she will arrive at some different conclusions.</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>GENERAL COMMENT</p> <p>Thank you for asking me to review this manuscript titled “Seroprevalence of syphilis in Human Immuno-deficiency Virus (HIV) positive individuals attending immuno suppressed Syndrome clinic at international hospital kampala”. The issue is of paramount importance since the prevalence of HIV infection is still very high in Sub-Sahara Africa. The study was a cross-sectional prevalence study. Hhowever, the current manuscript suffers from a number of shortcomings especially in the methods and results sections. Given the importance of the issue</p>	