



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAMPS_11241
Title of the Manuscript:	Zidovudine-Induced Anaemia in Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infected Children on Highly Active Anti-Retroviral Therapy in Jos, Nigeria
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 (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 the methods section, the authors said patients switched from ZDV to 4dT or transfused were excluded for analysis; however in the results, those cases are described? In a cohort study, excluding in the analysis the cases of switching from and to minimizes the impact of the ZDV induced-anaemia which can lead to false figures. So at each stage the percentages should correspond to actual remaining cases and not to the starting population. Line 123-154: Construct 2 or three multi-crosstabulation tabs to be more clearly synthetic and avoid long narrative text that is exhaustive and confusing in reading. E.g. Age vs Gender, Age vs Haemoglobin evolution... <table><tr><th></th><th colspan="2">Baseline</th><th>3m</th><th>6m</th><th>12m</th></tr><tr><th>Age</th><th>Anemia</th><th>severe</th><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td><1month</td><td>86</td><td>6</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>1-5Y</td><td>143</td><td>9</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td><6-10y</td><td>95</td><td>4</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>>11</td><td>21</td><td>18</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>345</td><td>37</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>		Baseline		3m	6m	12m	Age	Anemia	severe				<1month	86	6				1-5Y	143	9				<6-10y	95	4				>11	21	18				Total	345	37				In the methodology we clarified that we excluded those that were switched from ZDV to d4T from subsequent analysis. What we meant is that for those that were switched before 3 months analysis, they were included in the ZDV column for the 3 months analysis but were not subsequently included in the d4T column. Those that were switched between 3 and 6 months were included in the ZDV column for the 6 months analysis but were not subsequently included in the d4T column. Those that were switched after 6 months were included in the ZDV column for the 12 months analysis. This did not give false figure on the impact of ZDV-induced anaemia. They were excluded from subsequent analysis after the scheduled 3 months, 6 months, and 12 months evaluation. We have clarified this in the text. We have created 2 cross-tabulation tables.
	Baseline		3m	6m	12m																																							
Age	Anemia	severe																																										
<1month	86	6																																										
1-5Y	143	9																																										
<6-10y	95	4																																										
>11	21	18																																										
Total	345	37																																										



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Since by definition anaemia and severe anaemia differ within age ranges, it would be better articulate the data by age stratifications. Data in table 2 should be revised to take in account the severe anaemia cases withdrawn. Line 167-172: The results do not show correlation between age and severe anaemia presented in line 129-131 “(Seven (18.0%) of those aged 11-15 years had severe anaemia compared to 6 (6.5%) of those aged <1 year, 9 (5.9%) of those aged 1-5 years, and 4 (4.0%) of those aged 6-10 years (P = .02))” . So revise statistics and argumentation.	The data has been stratified by age. Revised We have revised this by using the mean Hb level.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 58-60: was really the study aimed at comparing ZDV and Stavudine combined regimens? Line 64 and 66: harmonize the words programme and program Line 91: with CD4 T <25%? Table 2 and Figure 1: Normally, it is recommended to present data in either Table or Figure and not both for the same data. Line 162-166: The sentence is not really a discussion; remove.	This has been revised Revised Corrected Table 2 has been modified. This has been removed.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		