

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Hematology Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_125062
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>MAGNITUDE OF HAEMATOLOGICAL AND IMMUNOLOGICAL ABNORMALITIES AMONG HIV INFECTED ADULT PATIENTS ON ANTIRETROVIRAL THERAPY AND TREATMENT NAIVE PATIENTS AT A COMPREHENSIVE CARE CENTRE IN KIAMBU COUNTY, KENYA: A COMPARATIVE STUDY</b>
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript titled <b>"Magnitude of Haematological and Immunological Abnormalities among HIV Infected Adult Patients on Antiretroviral Therapy and Treatment Naive Patients at a Comprehensive Care Centre in Kiambu County, Kenya: A Comparative Study"</b> provides significant value to the scientific community. It addresses the critical topic of haematological and immunological abnormalities in HIV patients, a vital concern in global healthcare, particularly in resource-limited settings like Kenya. The comparative analysis between ART-treated and ART-naive patients is crucial for understanding the effectiveness of ART in improving health outcomes and the specific challenges faced by treatment-naive patients. Additionally, this research sheds light on the need for early intervention and continuous monitoring, which can help reduce morbidity and mortality associated with HIV.</p> <p>This manuscript is particularly important because it fills a gap in data regarding the magnitude of these abnormalities in the Kenyan context, which is valuable for local and global healthcare strategies. I appreciate how the study is grounded in practical outcomes that can directly influence public health policies and patient care practices. However, the manuscript could benefit from further exploration of the long-term impact of these abnormalities on patient quality of life and broader discussions on therapeutic interventions beyond ART.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the manuscript, <b>"Magnitude of Haematological and Immunological Abnormalities among HIV Infected Adult Patients on Antiretroviral Therapy and Treatment Naive Patients at a Comprehensive Care Centre in Kiambu County, Kenya: A Comparative Study,"</b> is informative but quite lengthy and somewhat complex. It clearly conveys the study's focus but could benefit from simplification for better readability and impact.</p> <p>An alternative, more concise title could be: <b>"Haematological and Immunological Abnormalities in HIV-Infected Adults: A Comparative Study of ART-Treated and ART-Naive Patients in Kiambu County, Kenya."</b></p> <p>This revised title still captures the key elements of the study while being shorter and easier to digest.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive, as it provides a clear overview of the study's aims, methodology, results, and conclusions. However, there are a few areas where improvements can be made to enhance clarity and ensure that it fully encapsulates the study. Here are my suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Inclusion of Background Information:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Suggestion:</b> Add 1-2 sentences of background to provide context for why the study is important. For instance, mentioning the global and regional burden of HIV and the significance of haematological and immunological abnormalities in the disease's progression would be helpful.</li> <li><b>Reason:</b> It provides the reader with a clearer understanding of why this study was conducted and why it matters in the larger context of HIV care.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Clarify the Results Section:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Suggestion:</b> The results section in the abstract is quite detailed, but it can be streamlined for clarity. Instead of including multiple specific numbers, focus on the most critical findings, such as the prevalence of abnormalities and the key differences between ART-treated and ART-naive patients.</li> <li><b>Reason:</b> Overloading the abstract with too many statistical details can make it harder for readers to extract the key points. The most important findings should be highlighted, with full details left for the main body.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Highlight Study Implications:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Suggestion:</b> Briefly mention the implications of the findings, such as how routine monitoring of haematological and immunological parameters can improve patient outcomes. Currently, the conclusion calls for routine monitoring, but it doesn't explicitly mention how these findings could shape clinical practice or policy.</li> <li><b>Reason:</b> This will help readers understand the potential impact of the study and why it is relevant for the scientific and medical communities.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Rephrase Certain Sections:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Suggestion:</b> For better readability, consider rephrasing some complex phrases. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>"Blood samples were collected in EDTA anticoagulant"</i> could be rephrased as <i>"Blood samples were collected using EDTA tubes to prevent clotting."</i></li> <li><i>"Unpaired T-test with Welch's correction"</i> can be simplified to <i>"Comparative analysis was performed using an unpaired T-test with Welch's correction."</i></li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Reason:</b> The goal is to maintain scientific accuracy while ensuring the abstract is accessible to a broader audience.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Omission of Minor Details:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Suggestion:</b> The specific numbers for CD4 count differences, while important, may not be necessary in the abstract unless they are significant findings. Consider focusing on the general observation rather than exact figures.</li> <li><b>Reason:</b> This will keep the abstract concise and focused on the main takeaways without overwhelming readers with data.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be generally appropriate, as it follows the conventional format for scientific research papers. However, a few adjustments could improve clarity and readability, particularly for those unfamiliar with the specific methodologies used. I suggest the following points for improvement of the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Abstract</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Appropriate:</b> The abstract follows the typical structure of presenting the aim, methodology, results, and conclusions.</li> <li><b>Suggestion:</b> As mentioned earlier, it could be slightly simplified and made more concise by focusing on the key findings and their implications.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Introduction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Appropriate:</b> The introduction effectively introduces the problem of HIV and its associated haematological and immunological abnormalities. It gives a good overview of the global HIV burden, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, and provides the rationale for conducting the study in Kenya.</li> <li><b>Suggestion:</b> A more explicit statement of the study's objectives towards the end of the</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>introduction would help clarify the paper's purpose. Currently, it's implied but could be more direct.</p> <p><b>3. Methodology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Appropriate:</b> This section is well-organized with clear subsections, including Study Site, Study Design Period and Population, Eligibility Criteria, Sample Size, Sampling Method, Data Collection, and Laboratory Procedures.</li> <li>• <b>Suggestion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Sample Size subsection could be simplified. The inclusion of the sample size calculation formula might be too technical for the general reader. Consider summarizing the key points and relegating the detailed calculation to an appendix or supplementary material.</li> <li>○ Data Collection and Laboratory Procedures are quite detailed, which is important for reproducibility. However, some procedural details, like step-by-step equipment operation, might be simplified or moved to supplementary materials unless they are critical to the study's findings.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>4. Results</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Appropriate:</b> The results are well-organized with clear tables and comparisons between ART-treated, ART-naive, and control groups. This is critical for interpreting the differences between these populations.</li> <li>• <b>Suggestion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The presentation of statistical data is appropriate, but the use of too many numbers in the text (like precise means and standard deviations) can overwhelm the reader. Consider focusing on key findings in the text, while detailed data can be kept in the tables.</li> <li>○ The addition of figures or graphs to visualize key comparisons (e.g., prevalence of abnormalities across groups) would enhance understanding.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>5. Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Appropriate:</b> The discussion is thorough and compares the study's findings with other studies, helping to contextualize the results.</li> <li>• <b>Suggestion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The discussion could benefit from a more structured breakdown of specific points, such as grouping discussions of anemia, leucopenia, and thrombocytopenia under separate subheadings. This would help organize the comparisons with other studies and strengthen the interpretation.</li> <li>○ Consider adding a subsection on Limitations to acknowledge potential weaknesses (e.g., sample size, geographic focus) and how they might affect the generalizability of the findings.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>6. Conclusion and Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Appropriate:</b> The conclusion succinctly summarizes the study's findings and calls for the routine monitoring of HIV-infected patients.</li> <li>• <b>Suggestion:</b> It could be expanded slightly to include a few more actionable recommendations based on the findings (e.g., policy implications for healthcare settings in Sub-Saharan Africa).</li> </ul> <p><b>7. References</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Appropriate:</b> The references are well-organized, and the citations are relevant to the study. Proper citation formatting is followed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Consistency:</b> Ensure consistency in terminology across the manuscript, especially with abbreviations (e.g., ART-treated, ART-naive). Define abbreviations when first mentioned.</li> <li>• <b>Visual Elements:</b> The use of tables is strong, but additional visual aids like graphs or flowcharts (e.g., study design, participant flow) would make the results more accessible to readers.</li> </ul>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its clear methodology, well-defined study population, and use of validated analytical techniques. The study employs appropriate statistical methods, such as the unpaired T-test with Welch's correction, to compare haematological and immunological parameters between ART-treated and ART-naive patients, ensuring that the comparisons are statistically reliable. Furthermore,</p>	

**Review Form 3**

	the use of advanced laboratory equipment like the DYMIND DF-52 haematology analyzer and FACSCalibur system for CD4 count measurement enhances the accuracy of the results. Additionally, the study's conclusions are supported by comprehensive data and are consistent with previous research findings, adding credibility to the scientific correctness of the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	<p>The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and relevant to the study topic, covering key aspects of HIV-associated haematological and immunological abnormalities. Many of the sources are well-established and provide a strong foundation for the research. However, while the manuscript does include a few recent sources, some of the references are slightly dated, with several from the early 2000s and even the late 1990s.</p> <p><b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Inclusion of More Recent Studies:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider including more references from the past five years (e.g., 2019–2023) to reflect the latest findings in HIV research, especially in the context of ART and haematological abnormalities.</li> <li>Updated statistics on HIV prevalence, ART coverage, and haematological complications from recent WHO reports or UNAIDS updates would make the study more current.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b>Additional Reference Suggestions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Recent Global HIV/AIDS Reports:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNAIDS Global HIV/AIDS Statistics 2023: Provides the latest global data on HIV, ART, and related outcomes, helping to contextualize the findings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Link: <a href="https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/fact-sheet">https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/fact-sheet</a></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Recent Studies on Haematological Abnormalities and ART:</b></li> </ol> <p>Including more recent and relevant references would strengthen the manuscript's scientific foundation and align it with the latest advancements in HIV research.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	Arinze Favour Anyiam
Department, University & Country	Igbinedion University, Nigeria