

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_128991
Title of the Manuscript:	Acceptability of Positive Deviance Mentorship among exposed HIV clients living with diabetes in Eastern Uganda A cross-sectional study
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses a significant gap in the management of dual diagnoses of HIV and diabetes, particularly in resource-constrained settings like Eastern Uganda. By evaluating the acceptability of Positive Deviant Mentorship (PDM), it provides actionable insights into how culturally sensitive mentorship can enhance diabetes knowledge and glycemic control among HIV clients. The study's findings contribute to public health literature, offering a scalable and community-based intervention model with potential implications for similar contexts globally. Its emphasis on quantitative measures enhances the robustness and generalizability of the results, making it a valuable resource for policymakers and health practitioners.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Acceptability of Positive Deviance Mentorship among exposed HIV clients living with diabetes in Eastern Uganda: A cross-sectional study," is descriptive but slightly verbose. A more concise and engaging title could be: "Evaluating the Acceptability of Positive Deviance Mentorship among HIV Clients with Diabetes in Eastern Uganda."	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from a few refinements for clarity and focus: Mention the specific statistical outcomes (e.g., satisfaction percentages) only once to avoid redundancy. Clarify how the results contribute to broader public health interventions. Suggestion: Include a brief mention of the limitations of the study to provide a balanced overview.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically accurate and well-grounded in methodology. However: Clarify how cultural appropriateness was specifically assessed in the intervention. Provide more details on the tools used to measure diabetes knowledge improvement.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, but the following additions might strengthen the manuscript: Include studies or reviews on PDM applications in other regions or health conditions. Add WHO or other global guidelines on mentorship in chronic disease management to contextualize the findings.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communication, but there are minor issues with redundancy and overly long sentences. Editing for brevity and precision would enhance readability.	
Optional/General comments	Discuss the scalability of the PDM intervention to other diseases or regions. Highlight any challenges faced during implementation and how they were addressed. Consider including graphical representations (e.g., pie charts or bar graphs) of the acceptability scores to make the results more visually engaging.	

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:	M Vijayasimha
Department, University & Country	The Neotia University, India