

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
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

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>
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.	I found it to be one of the competent papers for the ending of the epidemic of HIV and AIDS as empirical information. I like this report because I hope that it will be useful for the policy and operational level as an information tool in Ghana and the nation, which has similar characteristics as in central Ghana.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	I suggest keeping key words in alphabetical order.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Not much appropriately. Could be make little concise.	
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.	I have found that it is a scientific and technically sound paper in terms of its methodology and the analysis part for the findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	I found it is sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I suggest for minor revision on the writing of manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The conclusion and recommendation could be link with SDG.	

Review Form 3

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:	Mahendra Giri
Department, University & Country	Nepal