

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_127379
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINANTS OF UPTAKE OF HIV/AIDS VOLUNTARY COUNSELLING AND TESTING SERVICES AMONG THE HEALTH CARE WORKERS IN MERU TEACHING AND REFERRAL HOSPITAL, MERU COUNTY KENYA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a critical public health issue— <i>HIV prevention among healthcare workers</i> —who play a vital role in managing the epidemic. By identifying determinants of VCT uptake, the study provides valuable insights into barriers and facilitators that can inform tailored interventions to enhance testing rates and reduce HIV transmission risks within healthcare settings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Generally, title is well-stated but could benefit from slight refinements for clarity and conciseness. It can be re-stated as <i>"Determinants of Healthcare Workers' Uptake of Voluntary Counseling and Testing for HIV/AIDS at Meru Teaching and Referral Hospital, Kenya."</i>	
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.	It appears comprehensive; However, the method section needs to be restructured for clarity and conciseness e.g., <i>"A descriptive, cross-sectional study was conducted among 193 participants selected through stratified random sampling. Data were collected using a semi-structured questionnaire and analyzed using SPSS version 21. Results were presented using frequency distribution tables, with statistical significance set at $p < 0.05$."</i> Also, the results section has Areas for Improvement as highlighted below. 1. Redundancy: Repetition of statistical significance language (e.g., $P = .042 < 0.05$) is lengthy and could be streamlined. Also, some findings (e.g., high level of knowledge) are overstated unnecessarily. 2. Clarity: The moderation effect explanation is confusing and needs rephrasing. Then some sentences lack proper grammatical structure, e.g., "it was that availability of guidelines." 3. Statistical Errors: The phrase " $P = .03 < .04 < .05$ " is unclear and likely incorrect. The significance threshold should consistently be expressed as $p < 0.05$. 4. Professional Tone: Avoid casual phrasing such as "was shown to" or "found to have no influence."	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it employs a well-defined descriptive cross-sectional study design suitable for exploring determinants of VCT uptake among healthcare workers. The use of stratified random sampling ensures a representative participant pool, reducing selection bias. Data collection through a semi-structured questionnaire adds rigor by combining standardized and open-ended responses, enabling comprehensive analysis. Additionally, the statistical analysis using SPSS and clearly stated significance levels ($p < 0.05$) enhances the reliability and validity of the findings. The study addresses a critical public health 	

Review Form 3

	issue and provides actionable insights, contributing valuable knowledge to the field.	
<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>Yes, however consider these Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure proper citations are placed immediately after claims that are factual or taken from specific reports or studies. 2. Rephrase general statements in a way that reflects your own interpretation or understanding, even if the content is commonly known. 3. Use direct quotes, when necessary, particularly for specific statistics or unique wording, and provide citations in the appropriate format. <p>Note: Re-read through the Introduction/background section, paragraphs 1, & 2 to add the possible missing citations.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	No other major comments to add.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Godfrey Mugisa
Department, University & Country	Uganda Martyrs University, Uganda