

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The author has clearly stated the importance of this study, highlighting a few areas where the same was done, and the fact that it needs to be done in Guinea too. This makes the same a valid study/manuscript and important for the scientific community</p> <p>Do a few paragraphs on the justification for the study, picked from the information already available under introduction/background of the study</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is appropriate for the article, except if this journal has a word limit. The only addition is the use of the title case in the title if appropriate</p> <p>Consider accepting the corrections suggested in the title, and add a few more as appropriate</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Write the acronyms/abbreviations in full at first mention before subsequent use of them e.g. AIDS, HIV, WHO.</p> <p>Avoid personalization. Used third party reporting instead, e.g. A total of 205/534 samples were collected. Again it was not the HIV+ patients that were collected ; report correctly what was collected, or instead say, were enrolled, not collected.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Not really, the manuscript has a lot of information very valid and appropriate for science but not well arranged.</p> <p>I suggest the author should have at least the following format in his article; Title, abstract, introduction/background, main objective, specific objective, research questions, methodology (design, population, ethics approval, sampling technique, inclusion and exclusion criteria, sample collection and analysis), results, discussion, conclusion, recommendations, references.</p> <p>Check on the journal specifications for tables and figures; I've seen them all lumped up at the end of the article and not in the specific sections where they are discussed in texts. Ignore if this is what the journal specified. If not, move them to their specific sections in the document.</p> <p>On definition of variables, only list and define words that have been used in this document. For example, I've not met bachelors in the document except where the author defines it.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The publications cited for the same study (Benin and Morocco) were equally small scale studies whose outcomes might not be inferred for many other countries. This makes it necessary for the author to do this study and have data and report that is applicable for their specific location. If anything, nothing hinders doing a similar study already done elsewhere as long as there is justification</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>The references are sufficient though only 30% are current, majority (over 70%) are over 5 years old.</p> <p>Data on HIV for example on mortality cases are reported yearly and the author should cite most current ones as late as 2023. Remember HIV related mortalities change yearly because of many dynamics including ART universal access as well as other health priorities like COVID-19 infection that disrupted the health system. Check on WHO and UNAID reports and the altered target.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The grammar and use of language may not be very suitable. A number of changes suggested in track changes that if accepted will improve this article greatly.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The document is a powerful one for scholarly consideration if all the correctons suggested are considred.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Levis O. Wandolo
Department, University & Country	Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology (MMUST), Kenya