

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_85135
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE AND BARRIERS TO TREATMENT COMPLIANCE AND ITS DETERMINANTS AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS WITH ACUTE ILLNESS IN IKWERRE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA
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:

(<https://www.journalajrnh.com/index.php/AJRNH/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>Title of Manuscript:Not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Recommended to rephrase the title especially the word “acute illness” and add the year of study conducted. In addition, the boarding school and rural setting also can be considered. <p>Abstract:Not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Recommended to highlighted the calculation of sample size for the study2. What is the “snacking was a common habit” related to the compliances?3. The Conclusion is not complete and repeated what already highlighted in result <p>INTRODUCTION:Not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Too short and the author recommended to highlighted the prevalence of previous study in other countries and in Nigeria2. The instrument explanation should be in Method section.3. The “Rural” setting should be in Title4. Is the compliance issues is the Public concern in this study ? <p>Method: Not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The method section is too weak and the author should include:<ol style="list-style-type: none">i. The required sample size. Please insert the formula in this sectionii. highlighted how the data collection was conducted ? Who are responsible to collect the data ?iii. The “Study answer question...” paragraph is not important.iv. The analysis explanation too long, please summarized. In addition, there are no bivariate analysis and 95% CI. Please check the result. <p>Results: Not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The table and figure should be review as many of them can be combine as one.2. The figure 1 is related to this 104 patients ? if not, please don't include.3. The paragraph of “To answer the question of what is...” is not important and should be delete.4. Level of adherence (Compliance) calculation should be in Method section5. The Table 5 explanation should be related to Table 5. (not somethings else)6. What is the eating habit and Physical activity have to do with the compliance ? <p>Discussion: Not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Refer to paragraph 1, no statistical analysis done in the result section.2. Please not repeat the findings in the discussion section3. Please compare this findings with other study to substantiated your finding. <p>Conclusion Recommendation : Not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Please review for the language.2. Please check whether this study have done statistical analysis?3. Not very convincing and recommended not to include the findings data in this section <p>References:Not well written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The reference must follow the index medicus style of reference writing. (refer on how to write abbreviation for journal)	

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	This manuscript entitled " Prevalence and Barriers to Treatment Compliance And Its Determinants Among Secondary School Students With Acute Illness in Ikwerre Local Government Area of Rivers State, Nigeria" was not very clear and well-conceived. Several problems were identified.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lim Kuang Kuay
Department, University & Country	Institute for Public Health, National Institutes of Health, Malaysia