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	I am very confused with the study aim and hypothesis. It was stated that This study was an attempt to find out whether the introduction of the treatment has had any impact on the health status of PLWHA. To study this, the health status of the PLWHA before and after the introduction of the treatment should be compare. otherwise how its impact could be shown? Then hypotheses included if ART affect the PLWHA health status, if it is better to have specific sites for the ART treatment and if HIV/AIDS related stigma will affect the health status of PLWHA. However there is only one question in the questionnaires related to the "health status": "How has your health been since you were put on the drug". The answer to this question included "it has improved tremendously", "it is okay", "it is difficult to tell", "no response". First the question and answer are not validated to clarify the "health status". Second the answers are subjective and more scientific measures should be used to classify the "health status". The method of the statistics are not appropriate, in particular the correlation analysis the dichotomous data from the questionnaires.	
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction is too long. Starting statement in each new session is not necessary. The writing is should be straightforward. Statistical formulae and Chi square tables are not necessary also.	

ethical issues in this manuscript	yes, survey and behavioural ethics are involved in this study	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ronald Wang**
Department, University & Country	**Department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong**