



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This is a paper on a potentially important topic and the authors have clearly done a great amount of work to gather and analyse the data presented here. The literature review is thorough, and the information presented here is from a region in which there is limited information about attitudes and stigma regarding HIV and AIDS. This paper, however, requires major revisions before it can be considered for publication in the journal. These revisions will be substantial and I will focus on them instead of going through the paper line by line. Overall, the paper needs to be written more as a scientific publication: right now it looks more like a thesis, with all the literature review, the presentation of the entire analyses with all the Chi square tests shown, discussion of the null hypothesis. The authors should structure it like a scientific publication using examples from the journal to guide them. In general, the introduction should be 3-4 paragraphs, there should be a paragraph on the setting, the methodology should be summarized in 4-5 paragraphs (including the specific analytic tests done), the results should have 6-7 paragraphs with 3-4 tables presenting the most significant findings in a summary form that is easy for the reader to understand, and then there should be 4-5 paragraphs of discussion of the key findings followed by 1-2	The literature reviews are deleted. The manuscript is now summarized to meet the guidelines of the journal. Done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	paragraphs of conclusion. The study also presents data that is about perceptions about health care that respondents reported to the investigators. No actual health data was collected, and therefore the paper cannot be about the actual contributions of ART to health conditions in the study area. Rather, the study is about reported adherence, perceived stigma, and feelings about taking ART in specialized centers and how these relate to the self-reported health condition of the participants, with sub-group analyses by gender. This type of data is important in and of itself, but it gives us no indication of the effect of ART on the health of people in the community. I would recommend that the authors change the focus of this paper to the data they actually have collected and analysed and be careful about over interpreting the work. Finally, the authors should be careful about some of the language used in the paper (for example referring to high risk behaviors for HIV transmission as “socially abhorrent). They should also be careful with some of the data and facts they report in literature review, especially regarding the difference between HIV 1 and 2. If the authors are able and willing to make these substantial revisions, this paper could make a solid contribution to the literature on HIV and AIDS in West Africa in the setting of improved access to ART.	Thank you very much for your valuable comments.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		