

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_96084
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and Pattern of Erectile Dysfunction among people living with HIV/AIDS in a Tertiary Hospital in North-central Nigeria
Type of the Article	Short 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:

(<https://www.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript addresses a very important and perhaps silent topic in HIV/AIDS patients, and therefore important for scientific community. The authors described the prevalence and patterns of erectile dysfunction among 300 HIV/AIDS patients attending a tertiary hospital in an African setting, where the topic of erectile dysfunction may perhaps be ignored. The title is suitable, and the abstract is comprehensive. The manuscript is well structured and it is impressive that the authors took time to present a very well written manuscript including attending to grammar and minimizing typographic errors. The manuscript seems to be scientifically correct to a great extent. However, in an attempt to further improve on the scientific correctness, the authors should make the following clarifications/ additions in their methods.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) They stated that 'on every clinic day, each male folder was assigned a number from 0 to the last' before sampling. The authors should clarify if they waited until all patients were present at the clinic before sampling, as this would rather be difficult since some patients may come while others have left. Let authors describe if it was possible on a normal outpatient clinic visit, to have the entire sampling frame of the day by the time of sampling. b) They further stated the 'first subject as selected by balloting, and thereafter, every 3rd patient'. What happened if the ballot fell on or close to the last number (you numbered from 0 to the last before balloting). You stated that there was an average of 6 patients interviewed per day, and one wonders how this would be possible in the index case if the ballot fell on terminal numbers. c) The authors researched on a sub-population (HIV/AIDS) where specific issues could directly contribute to ED, including HIV disease and specific treatments. I would prefer if the authors include these factors in the analysis, including 'duration since HIV diagnosis or HIV disease stage' and 'HAART regimen' classifying the regimens basing on those drugs known to erectile function. d) Could the authors have attempted to analyse for possible interaction effects in case the outcome of some of their variable depend on the value of another variable. <p>The references seem to be limited, but this could perhaps be related limited research on the topic.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Suitable	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	It is commendable that the authors wrote a well-structured manuscript with clear language, including attention also being given to grammar.	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sarah Nanzigu
Department, University & Country	Makerere University College of Health Sciences, Uganda