



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 article must be corrected in many sections. Authors did not follow the guidelines. 1-The abstract is not clear in the last part "The results of our study rejected the null hypotheses successfully implied a confirmation of what each of the hypotheses stated. So a generalization could be made, implying that the findings about the statistics of the sample could be applied to the parameter of the population. Please, try again. 2- The first time you use the abbreviation PLWHA is in the abstract and you have to explain it like this: People living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA). 3- In many sections of the introduction for example on line 79 you say: reference (9) reviewed...and you have to say WHO (2003) reviewed... Please correct it. 4-In the introduction you have to review all the references that you need to discuss your results. The reading of this section showed many articles referred to the subject of your research but also has commentaries of the authors that must be presented in the section discussion that is not present in the paper. In the last part of the introduction you must present the objective of the article and it is not present. 5-Methodology: Authors used statistical methods well known and it not necessary a full description of them only a minimal description and the reference.	Done. Done. Done. Done. Done. Done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6- Author must shorten the introduction is too long. 7-The results are interesting but you must put there the results without commentaries. 8- In this paper is absent the discussion where author must compare their results with other references. 9- After the above mentioned the conclusions could be written. 10- In the section: References, please follow the guidelines for authors	Done. The manuscript is now summarized to meet the guidelines of the journal.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I think that the results of this article could be important but the authors must follow the guidelines and try to write a discussion , the most important part of a scientific paper.	Thank you very much for your valuable comments.