

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Pathogen Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_128681
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of Adherence to Therapy and Medication Knowledge Among HIV/AIDS Patients in Presidential Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) Unit of University of Benin Teaching Hospital (UBTH)</b>
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the adherence levels and medication knowledge of HIV/AIDS patients in a resource-limited setting. By identifying key factors associated with non-adherence, such as comorbidities and pill burden, the study highlights critical areas for targeted intervention to improve treatment outcomes. Furthermore, the findings underscore the positive impact of medication knowledge on adherence, offering actionable evidence to inform counseling and educational strategies for healthcare providers. However, the study could be improved by addressing limitations such as the use of self-reported data, potential biases from convenience sampling, and the lack of detailed analysis of certain demographic factors. Strengthening these aspects would further enhance the reliability and applicability of the findings	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title of the article, " <b>Assessment of Adherence to Therapy and Medication Knowledge Among HIV/AIDS Patients in Presidential Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) Unit of University of Benin Teaching Hospital (UBTH)</b> ", is clear and descriptive	
<b>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.</b>	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive, but it can be improved by adding an acknowledgment section for the limitations of the study. While the abstract effectively outlines the aim, methods, results, and conclusions, it does not address key limitations, such as the reliance on self-reported data and the potential bias from convenience sampling. Including a brief mention of these limitations would provide a more balanced overview of the study's findings. Additionally, the authors could highlight the broader implications of the results for future research and healthcare interventions, particularly the need for improved patient education and strategies to address non-adherence.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct as it follows established research methodologies, including the use of standardized data collection tools like the Morisky Medication Adherence Scale and statistical analyses such as chi-square tests and logistic regression. The study design, data analysis, and interpretation of results align with scientific standards, ensuring the reliability of the findings. However, some areas could benefit from further clarity, such as providing more detailed justification for the sampling method and addressing potential biases associated with self-reported adherence data. Overall, the manuscript presents accurate scientific findings that are supported by evidence and appropriate statistical methods.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	No, the references in the manuscript could be improved by including more recent studies, particularly from the last five years, as some of the cited literature appears outdated. Ensuring that the references are up-to-date will enhance the relevance and credibility of the manuscript. For example, adherence assessment can be further strengthened by referencing the study titled " <b>Psychometric Measurements of the Adherence to Refills and Medication Scales Among Patients With HIV/AIDS in Indonesia</b> " ( <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vhri.2024.101027">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vhri.2024.101027</a> ), which discusses the use of the <b>Adherence to Refills and Medication Scale (ARMS)</b> . Incorporating recent tools like ARMS and including current research on medication adherence will provide a more comprehensive and updated foundation for the study.	

### Review Form 3

<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication; however, there is room for improvement. While the manuscript effectively conveys its key points, certain sections contain overly long and repetitive sentences that can impact readability and clarity. Simplifying complex sentence structures, ensuring grammatical accuracy, and improving word choice would make the text more concise and professional. Additionally, refining transitions between ideas and ensuring consistency in academic tone will enhance the overall quality, making the manuscript more polished and suitable for scholarly publication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	No, there do not appear to be any competing interest issues in this manuscript. The authors have not declared any conflicts of interest, and there is no indication of financial or personal relationships that could have influenced the study. To ensure full transparency, the authors should explicitly state a "Competing Interests" section, confirming that there are no conflicts of interest to disclose.  No evidence of plagiarism has been identified in this manuscript It is recommended to proceed with the manuscript for further review and consideration for publication.	

### **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>Aisha Maulidya Sari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia</b>