

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AIR_118025
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Collaborative Approaches to Community-Based Counselling Interventions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>	<p>Yes, it is important for scientific community. However, the number of FGD was not enough to have comprehensive and inclusive information's.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Not Comprehensive</p> <p>Partially, In the introduction the authors presented theoretical framework community-Based Participatory research (CBPR) . What's the important? In my opinion it may be good if you included in the method section. it was not visible being in the introduction</p> <p>In the method section, there is no data quality control (trustworthiness etc), Data analysis method were not presented in details.</p> <p>Partially, is it program evaluation?</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>No, the language should be edited. It is a lack of clarity.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I would like to congratulate the authors for addressing an important area which was not well addressed. However, the authors should edit the language clarity. It is good if the authors elaborate on the method section.</p> <p>In Method--- The participants' ages ranged from 45 to 55 years old, comprising three females (60%) and two males (40%). Among the counselors, two were female (67%) and one was male (33%). The community members included one female and one male, each comprising 50%. Counsellors' experience ranged from 6 to 15 years.-----This is part of the result section.</p> <p>The number of study participants was very small. Five individuals in one FGD), and three KII. So it was very small to have saturation of information. Why do the authors do only one FGD? The result was not well synthesis. Transcripts were not identify key themes and patterns related to the research questions. Please the authors should be revised the result and discussion section.</p>	

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:	Aboma Motuma
Department, University & Country	Haramaya University College of Health and Medical Sciences, Ethiopia