



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_36667
Title of the Manuscript:	'We don't want to be noticed collecting Drugs': the Effects of Stigma and Discrimination on Adherence to Medication amongst People Living with HIV in Tiv Land, North Central Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Line 40: explain "incidence rate" in the context of this study 2) Line 77-78: give a citation for this statement 3) Line 95: Explain the settings in the "other 2 locations". 4) Line 106: The questionnaire, as described, is semi-structured and should be described as such 5) Lines 107-108: where were the 796 HIV sero-negative individuals recruited from, and how? 6) Line 110: what informed the choice of the age range 18-65 years for this study? 7) Line 113: why were those with AIDS and Opportunistic infections excluded from this study? 8) Line 115-116: give the correct meaning of "SPSS". 9) Line 120-121: what qualified the 20 respondents for the in-depth interviews? 10) Line 121-122: what is the source of the interview guide, and who translated it to Tiv language? Why was this for every participant, given that 92.4% of them were literate? 11) Table 1: why were 1601, instead of 1621, questionnaires analysed? 12) Table 1 contains no data on occupation and income level of participants 13) Line 152: explain the statement 14) Lines 156-159: these assertions were not supported by data in Table 1. Explain these further, or expunge them from the manuscript 15) Lines 155-223: explain why only statements from 2 males out of the 10 reported from the in-depth interviews were disproportionately included 16) Line 225-226: give citations for this statement 17) Line 274-339: revise all 23 References to conform with the Vancouver style 18) Show evidence of Ethics Review Board approval for this study 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Show why N25,000, instead of N18,000, was used as minimum for the participants' income 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Explain the essence of recruiting HIV sero-negative participants into this study since there was no comparative analysis. 2) The 20 participants used for the in-depth interviews could have been used for focussed group discussions, while in-depth interviews should have been reserved for key service providers, like physicians, nurses, adherence counsellors and treatment support specialists; and leadership of PLWH Support Groups. 	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Simeon Achunam Nwabueze
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria