

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_114043
Title of the Manuscript:	UNDERSTANDING THE FACTORS PROMOTING MOTHER TO CHILD TRANSMISSION OF HIV/AIDS IN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalibrr.com/index.php/IBRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is extremely important to the scientific community. It addresses a crucial public health issue, mother-to-child transmission of HIV/AIDS, in a specific context, Nigeria. Understanding the factors that promote this transmission is essential to develop effective prevention and intervention strategies. 2. Yes, it is suitable. It is clear and concise and highlights the central focus of the study which is understanding the factors that contribute to mother-to-child transmission of HIV/AIDS in Nigeria. 3. Yes, the article summary is comprehensive. It begins by contextualizing the issue of mother-to-child transmission of HIV/AIDS in Nigeria as a significant public health challenge. It then describes the aim of the review, which is to identify and understand the key factors that promote this transmission, as well as evaluate the effectiveness of existing prevention interventions. The summary details the method used in the bibliographic research and highlights the amount of literature reviewed, the inclusion period of the studies and mentions that there were eligibility criteria. 4. Partially. The methodological part still needs to be more detailed. The authors comment that "approximately 57 literatures" were reviewed. It is important that this information is accurate, preferably that a flowchart of the studies analysed is presented, how many were excluded and why, and how many remained for the final analysis. Furthermore, it is important to justify the choice of the period investigated. I also suggest the presentation of a results session in item 2.0, with the presentation of a chart or table, containing the main information (authors, year of publication, study design, characteristics of the participants, summary of results and conclusions) of the works evaluated. 5. Yes, I believe that is correct. 6. Yes, they are enough. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	The manuscript has relevant points of discussion about the vertical transmission of HIV/AIDS in Nigeria, however, it needs to be better structured in relation to the results found.	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dayane Cristina de Souza
Department, University & Country	State University of Western Paraná, Brazil