

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_122401
Title of the Manuscript:	Etiologies and Factors associated with febrile consciousness disorders in people living with HIV (PLHIV), hospitalized in the infectious and tropical diseases department of the University Hospital Center (CHU) Donka, Guinea.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This retrospective study may be important to the clinical field as it tried identify factors associated with the death of HIV patients hospitalized for febrile consciousness disorder.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think the title should be changed into "Identification of factors associated with the death of HIV patients hospitalized with febrile consciousness disorder: A retrospective study".	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, the abstract looks comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the manuscript is structured in appropriate way.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes, I think this manuscript is scientifically correct. The results are clear and methodology is replicable. However, I recommend that authors mention the regression equation. Also, authors should mention how the described numerical and categorical variables.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The used references are sufficient but not all are recent.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Writing quality should be improved, many mistakes in punctuations were observed and sentences should be written as long paragraphs.	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hasanain Abdulhameed Odhar
Department, University & Country	Al-Zahrawi University College, Iraq