



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_4442
Title of the Manuscript:	SEROPREVALENCE OF CYTOMEGALOVIRUS AMONG HIV-INFECTED ADULT PATIENTS ON HAART
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Line 174: What is the basis to conclude that the higher prevalence of CMV among women is related to sexual transmission? Either cite studies and justify, or delete. 2. Discussions: It would be important to clarify that your analysis of risk factors for IgG positivity is hampered by the fact that nearly every person was IgG positive, and thus the study lacked power to detect risk factors for IgG positivity. Then you could emphasize the risk factors for IgM positivity since the higher numbers (7%) provide more power to detect them.	1. Line 174: I agree with the Reviewer's comment. No study seen to cite in support of that conclusion. Statement deleted and replaced with a more tenable explanation. 2. Noted and added.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Table 1: There appears to be a typo under Disease Stage, where it should be 3-4 rather than 2-4. 2. Tables 3 & 4: It would help the reader if you would show a column of odds ratios for each variable. The reader can calculate it with the numbers that are given, but it would add to the readability of the paper. 3. Line 171: Explain how this will impact the management of HIV infected patients. 4. Line 186: I assume you mean IgM seroprevalence. If so, add IgM. If not, add IgG. I am just concerned that the reader might interpret seroprevalence as IgG.	1. Corrected in Tables 1, 3 and 4. Thanks. 2. Columns of odds ratios added in Tables 3 and 4. 3. Line 171. Explanation provided. 4. Line 186. IgM added. Thanks
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Line 155: You might consider also citing a more recent, much larger study of US HIV-infected women here (Stover, JID, 2003). 2. Line 165: You might consider adding some citations of IgM prevalences among healthy individuals. One of the more interesting findings of this study was the elevated IgM prevalences among HIV-positive individuals. Rather	1. Line 155: Stover et al, 2003 cited. Thanks alot. 2. Some citations of IgM prevalences among healthy individuals given and a new paragraph created to discuss this. Thanks for references provided. Note that the introduction of new references has affected the reference section.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	than only compare to HIV-positive populations, your IgM prevalences could be compared to those among HIV-negative individuals, for example, in Norway (1.2%) (Strand, BJOG, 2012), Turkey (3.7%) (Uysal, Arch Gynecol Obstet, 2012), and a nationally representative population in the U.S. (3%) (Dollard, Clin & Vaccine Immunol, 2011).	
--	---	--