

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_104613
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Radio Health Sensitisation Programme on HIV Stigmatisation among Residents of Owerri Metropolis
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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relevance of the topic makes the manuscript quite important to the scientific community. The title is indeed suitable and relevant. Some important aspects to make the abstract more comprehensive and impactful need re-visit. (See in-text comments). Fairly appropriate but those on 'Methodology' and those on 'Discussion of Results' could be consolidated. Not until the analysis is made statistically meaningful e.g. no claim of statistical significance could be made on the bases of mere descriptive statistics. The tables should also be self-explanatory and statistically meaningful! References are adequate and fairly recent but must be edited as per editorial requirements. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quite good language style used although moderate language editing could be useful. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attend to all in-text 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:	Patrick Sibanda
Department, University & Country	University of Free State, South Africa