

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78973
Title of the Manuscript:	ADHERENCE TO ANTIRETROVIRAL THERAPY AMONG HIV/AIDS IN FEDERAL MEDICAL CENTRE, OWERRI
Type of the 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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	<p>We have read with great interest the article submitted to our attention which has the merit of addressing a crucial subject in the management of people living with HIV, adherence to antiretroviral therapy.</p> <p>The methodology and the choice of the variables of interest were well explained by the author with recourse to the contingency tables and the chi-square calculation in order to assess the significance of the differences observed between the frequencies.</p> <p>However, the choice of tables presented and the interpretation of the results need to be improved, to avoid confusing the reader's mind. For example, instead of presenting Table 5 and then Table 7 subsequently, it would be preferable to give priority to Table 7 which does not only present the frequencies but also the Chi2 and the "p" of significance. Same recommendation for Table 6 and 8. It should be remembered that in general, we focus more on the significance threshold and there is no need to give the value of Chi2 which allows the reader to have the essentials of what you must remember.</p> <p>The article is fairly recent and in relation to the entire history of medical care for PLWHIV it should be possible to provide references. For an article addressing such a subject, we believe that the number of references cited in the article (4) is too low, which immediately means that the results obtained have not enough been compared with the data in the literature.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Review the architecture of certain sentences that seem to be repeated the same thing in different ways, knowing that those who read the article are expected to have notions and experience of the scientific literature allowing them to also do their analysis and interpretation of the results. It is therefore in the interest not to dwell on explaining why such and such a result should be considered significant</p> <p>.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Improve the English writting</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Moukaila Abdou Razak
Department, University & Country	University of Lomé, Togo