

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_123903
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants Of Human Immuno Deficiency Virus (Hiv) Prevalence In The Central Region Of Ghana
Type of the 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**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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 manuscript is important in addressing the HIV prevalence by examining factors driving the prevalence in Central region of Ghana, which can inform effective prevention strategies. However, significant improvements are needed in both methodology and results section as pointed out in my comments on the primary manuscript. Methodology needs to be clearly explained and the analysis of determinants needs to be re-worked to ensure scientific rigor and reliability of the findings. ( e.g. the variable, hugging has unusually high value, 2.015 yet it should be between -1 to 1) These revisions will strengthen overall impact of the study.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable, however given that the findings point to a low HIV prevalence compared to the regional prevalence, it could be refined to make it more specific. Suggested title "Low HIV prevalence and its determinants in Central region of Ghana" Additionally, the spelling of "immumo deficiency" needs to be corrected to Immunodeficiency</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>The abstract provides a good starting point. However, more adjustments are needed to enhance clarity and scientific rigor, more so touching on the methodology and results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Time duration for data collection needs to be provided e.g. data was collected from January to February 2023</li> </ol> <p><b>Methodology</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Multiple logistic regression is mentioned yet it was not used, suggestion: remove it. Apply appropriate technique in analysis. Generally, methodology sections need significant improvement.</li> </ol> <p><b>Results</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The results lack specific details on how determinants were measured, and association with HIV prevalence</li> <li>4. Replace the term "strong correlations" with specific statistical findings</li> <li>5. Clarify whether the variables (sexual intercourse, contaminated sharps, blood transfusion) were self-reported behaviours or objectively measured. Also give a brief detail how they were analysed</li> <li>6. Factor values &lt;1.000 each. It is not immediately evident if "factor values" refers to factor analysis results or correlation coefficients clarify statistical method being referenced here</li> <li>7. The results lack sufficient detail in the presentation.</li> </ol> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. The conclusion is very general. It doesn't clearly explain any specific or actionable recommendations based on the findings. Suggestion: provide more specific recommendations e.g. blood screening before transfusion, sex education</li> </ol>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections are good however, Ethical consideration should come before results section.</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 manuscript has potential but shows areas that raise concerns regarding its scientific correctness. The methodology section requires more clarity, particularly in sampling and analysis techniques, to ensure that the results are robust and interpretable. A re-analysis of the determinants of HIV prevalence may be needed to avoid confusion over their inclusion. Currently, the lack of clear explanation of determinants (such as sexual intercourse, contaminated sharps, and blood transfusion) of HIV prevalence weakens its scientific rigor.</p> <p>I suggest a review of data quality and variable selection. E.g. only valid variables known to be directly related to HIV should be included in the analysis i.e. sex, sharps, blood transfusion, mother to child transmission</p>	

### Review Form 3

<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>Majority of references are ok; However, some references date back 24 years ago (e.g. ref no 33). Probably new studies have been done since then. I suggest revision.</b>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes though there are some unnecessary repetitions.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	SEE ATTACHMENT	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>James Onyuro Oketch</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology, Kenya</b>