

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_96800
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors associated with unmet needs for family planning among people living with HIV/AIDS in the South-South region of Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Yes, the manuscript explains the important phenomenon and it managed to link unmet needs for contraceptive use and HIV/AIDS 2. The title is suitable 3. The Abstract can be improved. The author can structure it in a way that readers can comprehend the salient issues raised in the whole article in a snapshot. The Abstract can have an opening statement which clearly outlines the problem statement and justification for the study. The Conclusion should be rich also showing the recommendations from the study. 4. Yes, they are appropriate; 5. Yes, the author did a thorough research and the methodology was clearly explained; 6. Yes, they're also current.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good command of English but it can be improved by a professional proof-reader	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1. The introduction was adequately articulated. The Researcher managed to craft the Introduction from a global to a national level and adequately justified the gaps the study sought to fill. 2. The discussion section can be improved, the author should have triangulated qualitative and quantitative research methods to ensure that quantitative data was qualified because quantitative data is showing the magnitude and yet the readers are also interested in the why.....	

### 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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Andrea Toweka</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe</b>