

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_110826
Title of the Manuscript:	Oral human papillomavirus infection in HIV-infected individuals – a systematic review and meta-analysis
Type of the Article	Review Article

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes, this systemic review and meta-analysis reporting the prevalence of oral human papillomavirus in HIV positive population is important as it provides the readers with a numbers perspective to understand why HPV can persist longer in immunocompromised individuals. 2. Is the title of the article suitable? Yes 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? No. the abstract needs to be re-written. The background needs to be more precise to make the readers grasp the connection between HPV and HIV. The last sentence of the methodology should be moved to results section. The result section does not explain the results at all, instead it just states the inclusion and exclusion of studies for the meta-analysis. More appropriate keywords as per MeSH descriptors needs to be included. 4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes, the manuscript provides a clear and organized structure. 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Although the manuscript is scientifically correct, there is scope for improvement to make the article better and provide the scientific community with meticulous data. The forest plots showing prevalence of oral HPV in HIV infected individuals is not sufficient for a meta-analysis. The authors are encouraged to look at the differences in prevalence gender wise, the type of sample for HPV analysis (saliva or biopsy), and also compare the prevalence of high-risk vs low-risk HPV subtypes in the HIV positive individuals. It is good to include specificity analysis in addition to sensitivity as it helps the readers to determine how robust the overall findings of your meta-analysis are. 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? The references for the introduction section need to be updated with the recent data. Other comments: i) The introduction section is too short and the flow is inaccurate. Needs to be more precise with additional information leading to the research question. ii) For table 2, reference numbers need to be inserted. iii) Both the introduction and discussion sections are written in small paragraphs of 1-2 sentences and in some case 2-3 sentences. This does not help the readers to connect the dots as it looks like the authors are just providing condense information. A lot of these can be elaborated which will give more clarity to the article.	 1. Thank you for all comments 2. We altered the abstract, introduction and the initial part of the discussion 3. We improved the English of the paper 4. We inserted the reference numbers of the table 2
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 Moderate level of improvement in the language quality is required.	
Optional/General comments		

[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>	