

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_116063
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring Determinants of mortality among Adult PLHIV under ART at Meru Teaching and Referral Hospital, Kenya
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the article is very important to the scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is appropriate.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive of the article but it's long and needs to be shortened and focused on the objectives of the study some phrases need to be rephrased to form complete sentences.</p> <p>4. Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I would like to thank you for choosing me as a reviewer for one of the articles submitted to your journal</p> <p>The article is good, but there are some notes:</p> <p>The abstract is long and needs to be shortened and focused on the objectives of the study some phrases need to be rephrased to form complete sentences.</p> <p>On the page 11, the researcher pointed out the importance of social distancing and compared it with the Hills &amp; Eraso (2021) study on the rules of distancing when infected with COVID-19. The rules of distancing between COVID-19 and HIV cannot be compared because the two viruses differ in the ways of transmission.</p> <p>Page 16, the researcher mentioned that the death rate is higher for males than for females. Likewise, the unemployed have a higher death rate than those who are employed, but he did not explain the reasons that led to these higher death rates associated with males and the unemployed.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ahmed Hieran Ramadan AL-jabery</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>College of Science, Thi-Qar University, Iraq</b>