

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_118592
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Thyroid Profile (TSH, T3 and T4) of HIV Positive Subjects Visiting Central Hospital, Benin City, Edo State
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:

<https://www.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.7

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, but with slight modification here is suggested amendment "Evaluation of Thyroid Profiles (TSH, T3, T4) in HIV Positive Patients at Central Hospital, Benin City, Nigeria"</p> <p>Yes but has been re written see attached article</p> <p>No The introduction was revised – Materials and Methods were re written and thesis written format were omitted. See attached article indicated in red colored text</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The result explanation was scattered with each table need to be collected in one manuscript with mentioning the tables and figures and finally subsections will be as follows – Abstract, Introduction, Material and Methods, Results and Discussion including conclusion (see article) Finally the Consent, Ethical Approval and competing Interests Disclaimer were reasonable.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The article is excellent but was provided typically as summarized research thesis or dissertation – I made my amendments accordingly for an original research article	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mutaz Mohamed Ibrahim Ali
Department, University & Country	University of Medical Sciences and Technology (UMST), Sudan

Review Form 1.7