# **Review Form 1.6**

| Journal Name:            | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research   |
|--------------------------|--|
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JAMMR_84453   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Perception of HIV/AIDS among tertiary education students in the Tamale Metropolis and their willingness to take the HIV test |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Article  |

## **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy)

## **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 |  |  |
|                              |  |  |
|                              |  |  |
|                              |  |  |
|                              |  |  |
| Minor REVISION comments      |  |  |
|                              | After reviewing this research article it is found that researcher has discussed the perception |  |
|                              | of HIV/AIDS among tertiary education students and their willingness to take the HIV test.      |  |
|                              | Further researcher has given sound research work done by various researchers. However it       |  |
|                              | is found that hypothesis are missing also Criteria for selection of sample is not mentioned    |  |
|                              | clearly. Third researcher should pendown the suggestion too. So on the basis of my review      |  |
|                              | I suggest the researcher to mention these things after that paper should be published          |  |
| Outional/Outside Samuel      |  |  |
| Optional/General comments    |  |  |
|                              |  |  |
|                              |  |  |
|                              |  |  |
|                              |  |  |

## PART 2:

|  |   | 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? | Researcher have mentioned that this work is done under ethics |   |

## **Reviewer Details:**

| Name:                            | Mohammad Amin Wani                    |  |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Department, University & Country | Lovely Professional University, India |  |

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)