

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_100520
Title of the Manuscript:	Survival Patterns of HIV-TB Co-Infected Patients in Selected Counties in 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.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/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)
--	---------------------------	--

Review Form 1.7

<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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, but the primary aim of the study is not very clear from the manuscript. Could be made concise</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes but could be rephrased to convey the message better</p> <p>No. The methodologies part specially the statistical analysis could have been more concise. Also the reason why these particular counties were chosen were not clear. Also whether it included patients only from OPD Inpatient Dept is not very clear. Also why both mean and median follow up times were used?</p> <p>Yea, but it's implications for the community is very vague.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>It is mentioned in the abstract that starting treatment later in the course of disease will be effective. If it is really proven by the study? Also the authors have not defined later like how many months after treatment or so</p> <p>Sentences should not be started with numbers or reference brackets.</p> <p>Results and discussion should not be clubbed together. The discussion should include positive points from the research, strength and weaknesses of the study etc.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Amrita Datta</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>AIIMS, India</p>