

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_117298
Title of the Manuscript:	THE CHEST RADIOGRAPHIC FINDINGS AND THE VIRAL LOAD IN ADULT PATIENTS WITH HIV/PTB CO-INFECTION.
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.journalajmcp.com/index.php/AJMPCP/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> <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. The manuscript is important for the scientific community. 2. The title of the article is not suitable. I suggest the title of the article to be renamed as. “Evaluation of chest radiographic pattern and its association with viral load among HIV/AIDS patients with pulmonary tuberculosis in a tertiary centre in Nigeria: a cross-sectional study” 3. The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. I suggest the authors to state sampling technique, study area, use of a data collection tool, statistical tool and statistical method. 4. The sub-sections and structure of the manuscript is not appropriate. In order to be clear for the reader, I suggest the authors to use sub-sections within the method section and clearly explain each sub-section. The following sub-sections are suggested: study design, study area, source and study population, sample size determination, sampling technique, data collection tool and approach, outcome measures, data quality assurance, statistical analysis, and ethical approval and consent to participate. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct with major concerns yet to address. 6. The references are sufficient and recent. 7. I suggest the authors to omit the section ‘Aim’ and instead incorporate the statement along with the introduction section. 8. Explain Nigerian perspective on the subject matter with respect to previously conducted studies in the same country. 9. State the name of the tertiary centre in Nigeria and explain in detail the study area. 10. What is the rationale behind using consecutive sampling method? 11. State whether your study is in line with the Declaration of Helsinki (2008). 12. I suggest the authors to include the full form of abbreviations used in the study. 13. Explain in detail the data collection tool used and its development process. 14. State the validity and reliability of the data collection tool. 15. Did the data collection tool subject to expert panel review? 16. I suggest the authors to omit the sub-sections of table description instead simply explain the tables as part of the result section while citing them in the appropriate text. 17. Variables that were found to be significant at bivariate logistic regression should be subjected to multivariable logistic regression. Did you do that during statistical analysis? 18. Avoid repetition of results in discussion, instead I suggest the authors to only interpret their findings while stating policy implications as necessary. 19. State recommendation of your study after conclusion section. 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The English quality of the article is not suitable. Massive English editing required. Moreover, coherence and readability of the manuscript need massive editing.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Nuru Abdu
Department, University & Country	Eritrea