

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_98583
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge, Infection Prevention Practice, And The Stigma Of Mpox Disease Among Men Who Have Sex With Men In Rivers State: A Cross-Sectional Study
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The paper is good. However, there were some questions in the tool based on the data presented that may not be accurate. Example, HIV status. If this is a self-administered questionnaire, the results will be reliant to the knowledge of the one answering it. The stigmatization was described based on the structured tool. It could have been better if there were qualitative approaches/techniques carried out to do probing or follow up questions to see the bigger picture.</p> <p>The title is fine as it is.</p> <p>The abstract may be unified not to reflect the sections of the discussion. It should be freely flowing following the same order.</p> <p>The manuscript presented too many pieces of information. Tables are overwhelming. Variables considered in the study that were used in hypothesis testing should have been supported by relevant and updated literature.</p> <p>References are adequate.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language used in the discussions are scientific though the results per se are perception-based.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Dennis G. Caballes
Department, University & Country	The National Teachers College, Philippines