

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_116656
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY ON THE OUTCOME OF ENHANCED ADHRENECE COUNSELING AMONG UNSUPPRESSED HIV CLIENTS IN BENUE STATE.
Type of the Article	Desk review

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is addressing a vital area in HIV care. After introduction of ART and since HIV is now regarded as a chronic condition issues of viral load suppression are critical. Enhanced adherence counselling is important to enhance this..</p> <p>The title is suitable. However, it lacks it needs to reflect that it involved reviewing of medical records. I suggest that it reads as follows: A STUDY ON THE OUTCOME OF ENHANCED ADHRENECE COUNSELING AMONG UNSUPPRESSED HIV CLIENTS IN BENUE STATE: RETROSPECTIVE MEDICAL RECORD REVIEW.</p> <p>The abstract needs to indicate that the study was a retrospective medical record review. The objective under abstract (This study assesses viral suppression after enhanced adherence counselling and its predictors among unsuppressed HIV seropositive people in the State) is missing other objectives that are included at the end of the introduction. They can be included for clarity.</p> <p>The inclusion criteria need to show that files were reviewed and should read as follows: All files of HIV-infected people with a viral load greater than 1000 copies/ml with repeat viral load results after complete enhanced adherence counselling sessions in Benue state, Nigeria. The exclusion criteria need to show that it was files that were reviewed as follows: All files of HIV-infected people who were on antiretroviral therapy for less than 6 months and those who did not start EAC sessions Files of patients with missing ART information. Files of patients with erroneous viral load data or conflicting information.</p> <p>2.5 Under data collection: The method of data collection is clear and needs to be incorporated in the abstract for clarity</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct, the researcher needs to correct what has been highlighted.</p> <p>They are sufficient</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review our study and for the insightful comments.</p> <p>We agree that the title should reflect that the study is a retrospective review of medical records . The title is now, A CROSS-SECTIONAL DESCRIPTIVE STUDY ON THE OUTCOME OF ENHANCED ADHRENECE COUNSELING AMONG UNSUPPRESSED HIV CLIENTS IN BENUE STATE: RETROSPECTIVE MEDICAL RECORD REVIEW.</p> <p>We have also captured the suggestion in the abstract.</p> <p>The study criteria has been corrected to show that files were reviewed.</p> <p>We have carried out the editing of the whole article. The initial errors in the English should not have been there.</p> <p>We have carried out corrections to ensure the conclusion and study objectives align.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There is need for general editing of the whole article by an English editor.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The second last paragraph in the discussion is not clear. It reads as follows:</p> <p>The major strength of this study was the usage of routine program data over one year, with information collected on all PLHIV who were on ART and had viral load >1000 copies/ml in Benue State.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>This information has not been reflected on the inclusion criteria(the usage of routine program data over one year), it needs to connect to your study. This paragraph is the first time you are mentioning this.</p> <p>The conclusion of this objective need to be clarified in the conclusion, The objective is as follows: to determine the predictors among unsuppressed HIV seropositive people in Benue state</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer’s comment Thank you for the insightful reviews We agree that the title should reflect that the study is a retrospective review of medical records . The title is now, A CROSS-SECTIONAL DESCRIPTIVE STUDY ON THE OUTCOME OF ENHANCED ADHRENECE COUNSELING AMONG UNSUPPRESSED HIV CLIENTS IN BENUE STATE: RETROSPECTIVE MEDICAL RECORD REVIEW. We have also captured the suggestion in the abstract. The study criteria has been corrected to show that files were reviewed. We have carried out the editing of the whole article. The initial errors in the English should not have been there. We have carried out corrections to ensure the conclusion and study objectives align.</p>	<p>Author’s comment <i>(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)</i></p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	