



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_3884
Title of the Manuscript:	PRODUCT OF FREE RADICAL INJURY AND ANTIOXIDANT STATUS OF NEWLY DIAGNOSED HIV SEROPOSITIVE PREGNANT WOMEN SEEN IN OSOGBO, NIGERIA

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In this manuscript, Atiba et al. examine the antioxidant status of newly diagnosed HIV seropositive pregnant women seen in Osogbo, Nigeria. The study is interesting even if the results are somehow expected. There are few questions: could the authors provide some informations on the antioxidant status of seropositive pregnant women infected with HIV-1 for a long time? The authors should discuss the role of GSH as antioxidant enzyme as they did for SOD1 and GPx1. Do they have any available data with patients under treatment?	- We appreciate effort put in place by the reviewer to intelligently read through this manuscript. Corrections have been made according to his suggestions. However, we offer explanation for the following - Information on seropositive pregnant women is not possible within the context of this study. Newly diagnosed patients were targeted. Besides all recruited subjects were discovered on routine screening. None was told of the infection beforehand. - The role of glutathione (GSH) as antioxidant. We agree, it functions also as antioxidant but the scope of this study did not consider measuring GSH. Discussing it may confuse the readers. However, it has now been briefly mentioned in the discussion. - Yes we are collating data of



SDI Review Form 1.6

		patients under treatment but this is being prepared for future reports.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are many typos that need to be carefully corrected. For example. Abstrast. Results. L. 1: "Highest and lowest..women (0.95+/-0.62)." should be replaced by "Highest and lowest..women (0.95+/-0.62) respectively." l. 207: "The addictive effect of these two radical generated clinical conditions may support our finding" instead probably of: "The additive effect of these two radicals generated clinical conditions that may support our findings". l.210: ""'in thier systemic.." instead of "...in their systemic.." The manuscript needs to be read and edited by the authors before being accepted.	- The manuscript has been read over and over again to correct typos as well as grammar. Those ones pointed out by the reviewer have been corrected and has been distinctly indicated in the script.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Interesting manuscript worth of publication but it needs to be carefully corrected for typos before being published.	