



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_48159
Title of the Manuscript:	Hepatitis B infection is the most common comorbidity in People living with HIV/AIDS; A retrospective study of the Efia Nkwanta Regional Hospital
Type of the 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	<p>There is inadequate literature review especially on Hepatitis B and HIV/AIDS comorbidity and its prevalence as well as the association between the drug combinations and body mass index with hepatitis B. The references are too few and only a few are recent.</p> <p>The clause 'most common' might not be necessary as part of the title.</p> <p>Abstract Aim is not clear Methods: Data for a retrospective study cannot be collected within a time frame only patients record within a stipulated time frame can be considered. There are gross grammatical errors. The word sociodemographic alone does not relate the information, 'Sociodemographic characteristics' can be used instead. Conclusion: Should be rewritten to reflect the scientific implications of the results and future prospects of the study. Background: There are repetition of words and paragraphs with scientific statements without references. Methodology: Should be reframed and minimize use of conjunctions. Grammatical errors should be corrected. Discussion: Comparison between dissimilar groups should be expunged. E.g. retrospective study should not be compared with findings of cross-sectional studies or meta-analysis. Results: Should include other serological markers if available and avoid qualitative grading of glycosuria and proteinuria because of its clinical implications and physiological interferences. Is there no record for complete blood count? Tables: Tables 2,3,4, 5 &6 have no keys. Drug name should be written in full on the keys.</p>	<p>Title has been corrected</p> <p>Corrected as suggested</p> <p>Reference added where necessary</p> <p>Discussion has been improved by adding recent references</p> <p>Revise as per the comments</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Authors should harmonize findings and correct typographical errors	
Optional/General comments	Manuscript is timely but requires current scientific information to make it sound and robust	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Yes, there are two ethical considerations from two review boards for a retrospective study. Clarify please</p>	