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Reviewer's report:

General comment: The authors aimed at evaluating hematological parameters in a cohort of naïve as well as treated HIV-positive patients. The subject matter is fairly interesting. However, the paper is not well written and it needs to be highly improved before recommending publication.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) The aim of the study must be stated thoroughly. If a comparison between groups has to be done, the authors must state which are the variables to be compared, which are the groups, etc.

2) Statistical analysis needs to be improved. The authors should provide different ways of presentation and different tests in case of Gaussian and non-Gaussian distribution of quantitative data. A test for comparison of qualitative data is lacking! As both HAART status and advanced disease seem to impact on the various rates of hematological abnormalities, this reviewer suggests to include significant variables in a logistic regression model to assess to actual role of each variable.

3) A table with demographic data in the two groups is needed.

4) The authors performed a useful comparison between patients receiving and not receiving HAART. However this reviewer would perform at-least a separate analysis between those received AZT-based HAART vs. other types of HAART.

5) Too many comparisons are performed. This fact increases the risk of type I error. This reviewer suggests to avoid useless comparisons (e.g. RDW, MCH, etc.).

Minor Essential Revisions

1) Level of English language is poor throughout the manuscript. E.g. at the end of introduction: “this study was assess…”; in the abstract, section “method”: “…May 2012 HIV …”; line 4 of statistical analysis: “HAAT”; etc.

2) The abstract is poorly informative and should be totally rewritten

3) P values are lacking in table 2. In table 3 this reviewer suggests to include absolute percentages and not relative ones

4) Conclusion is too long. It should be one or two-sentence long.

5) References should be updated and complete. This reviewer would add at-least
the following:


**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests