



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAMPS_13809
Title of the Manuscript:	THE CONTRIBUTION OF ANTIRETROVIRAL THERAPY TO IMPROVING THE HEALTH CONDITION OF HIV/AIDS PATIENTS IN THE NEW JUABEN MUNICIPALITY
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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. In your introduction and throughout the length of the manuscript, first define the terms at first mention before abbreviating them. 2. Do not use symbols (line 119) in standard manuscript write-up except where it is compulsory such as the use of mathematical symbols. 3. Line 235 – 239. The statement is not in line with the current trend. I refer you to my published article on “Total and CD4+ T-lymphocyte count correlation in newly diagnosed patients in resource-limited setting. Journal site: www.academicjournals.org/JMLD. 4. Line 167: In your literature, it was indicated that, ‘Adherence estimates were highly correlated with high viral load (Spearman’s rho = 0.615, p=0.000). Note that this is a negative correlation which might have resulted from smaller study sample size as observed past studies. 5. In order to conform to standard practice, list 5-6 authors before putting et al. Where this has been done, italicize et al. Remove comma and et al after the comma and 2009 indicated in the reference on line 810.	Done. In lines 83 and 84 the symbol & is changed to and. The literature review is taken out. Ok. This portion is deleted from the manuscript. Done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	1. There are challenges with the use of verbs in their present tenses when the study is reporting outcomes of research. All these should be corrected in the manuscript: Lines 725 (Put 'captured' rather than 'capture'), Line 728 ('attributed' instead of 'attribute'), lines 757 and 771 (put 'found' instead of find), Line 759 (put 'felt' instead of 'feel' and 'perceived' instead of 'perceive'). 2. Line 818 and 838: What pages in the journal did your referenced articles occupied? 3. Line 165, do you mean that the median self-reported adherence was 100% (range 0-100)? How do you explain this? 4. Line 135, use the word 'replicate' instead of replicating. 5. Instead of 'statistical package for social scientists' put 'Statistical Package for Social Sciences' (SPSS). 6. Table 7: Use the word 'treated' rather than 'treats' 7. Line 558: Put 'HIV status' instead of HIV/AIDS status. AIDS is the disease while HIV is the virus being tested for.	In line 281, capture is changed to captured. In line 284, attribute is changed to attributed. The rests are done as expected. Those portions are deleted. All the literature reviews are deleted. Done . In lines 31 and 141, 'Statistical Package for Social Sciences' (SPSS) is put instead of 'statistical package for social scientists'. Table 7 is deleted. Done in line 205.
---------------------------------------	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Generally, the article is an interesting one that will win public interest. It was well written only with minimal corrections giving the multi-factorial experiment and outcomes and the length of the paper. The statistical analyses were alright.	Thank you very much for your useful and encouraging comments.