

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_91950
Title of the Manuscript:	APPLICATION OF DISCRETE-TIME, RIGHT CENSORED SURVIVAL AND UNBALANCED THREE-STAGE HIERARCHICAL DESIGNS IN MODELING CHRONIC DISEASES AMONG THE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS: KENYA
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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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>1) According to the Journal template, the abstract must not exceed 300 words. Your summary contains 321 words. Please negotiate with the publisher. The summary is interesting and well done.</p> <p>2) There are many grammatical errors (easy to correct). I have pointed out some of those complained about by the Grammarly free program. The authors are not obliged to apply them, instead we recommend that the authors themselves do a rigorous grammar check with the text editor and eventually with the Grammarly free program. Along with the grammar check, the authors can also solve some apparently confusing expressions, some of which I noted on the reviewed manuscript attached to the review.</p> <p>3) There are some unexplained abbreviations that are recommended to be defined (STD, HELB, MMUST). There are also unexplained abbreviations that I consider to be in wide circulation: HIV/AIDs, NGO, etc. The latter can be negotiated between the authors and the publisher. I have marked on the reviewed manuscript the abbreviations that I think should be explained.</p> <p>4) For consistency, please write the ratios between the expressions either using the horizontal bar or the oblique bar, but not both in the same formula; It is recommended to number the equations; It is recommended to write all equations with the same equation editor; Mathematical symbols must have the same font, style and size, in equations as in text (otherwise they are considered symbols with different meanings).</p> <p>5) The authors are invited to check the calculations. I have pointed out two apparent (minor) errors, which do not change the results and conclusions, but it is good to be controlled. These suspicions are marked on the reviewed manuscript.</p> <p>6) The specification of the two universities from which the subjects of the study are chosen is a little confusing. I think the clarification should be made more clearly, possibly accompanied by a GIS map of their locations in Kenya and in the town of Eldoret (?). I also suggested a GIS map at the end of the reviewed manuscript.</p> <p>7) The manuscript is not written according to the Journal Template. Text font, references, titles and subtitles, spacing, etc. All the elements of the Template must be respected in a rewrite of the manuscript.</p> <p>8) It is interesting for the reader to know some examples of such questionnaires. The questionnaires and, if you wish, the answers, for verification, should be stored in a public archive where interested readers can access them.</p> <p>How many questions do the questionnaires contain, and how are the qualitative answers quantified? There are questions that can help readers to develop their own social investigations, the interest among readers increases in this way as well as the appearance of citations of the article, implicitly the reputation of the authors (and in this case, it is really worth it).</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The work is interesting and can be continued with the construction of a database with the help of which the research subjects exposed in the work can be monitored. I recommended a major revision because there are many small fixes to be made. There are also some passages that need to be clarified, I recommend insisting on them (the ones suspected of generating confusion: the location and number of universities, the explanation of the survival analysis). After the review, publication is recommended.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cardei Petru
Department, University & Country	The National Institute of Research Development for Machines and Installations Designed for Agriculture and Food Industry, Romania