

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_130371
Title of the Manuscript:	FIVE YEARS RETROSPECTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE PATTERN OF VIRAL LOAD SUPPRESSION AMONG ADULTS ON ANTIRETROVIRAL THERAPY IN A TERTIARY HOSPITAL NORTH-CENTRAL, NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>
<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 analysis the viral load suppression patterns among adults on antiretroviral therapy in a tertiary hospital in North-Central Nigeria. By highlighting factors associated with viral load suppression, the study provides valuable insights into improving HIV management outcomes in resource-constrained settings. The findings underscore the importance of adherence counseling for optimal treatment outcomes.	The above statements from reviewer are all true.
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title of the article, " <b>Five Years Retrospective Analysis of the Pattern of Viral Load Suppression Among Adults on Antiretroviral Therapy in a Tertiary Hospital, North-Central Nigeria,</b> " is clear but slightly lengthy. <b>1-Five-Year Analysis of Viral Load Suppression Patterns in Adults on ART in North-Central Nigeria"</b> <b>2-Trends in Viral Load Suppression Among Adults on ART: A Five-Year retrospective Study in North-Central Nigeria"</b>	Trends in Viral Load Suppression Among Adults on ART: A Five-Year retrospective Study in North-Central Nigeria. The title had been changed as suggested

Review Form 3

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.	<p>The abstract of the article is fairly comprehensive. However, it can be improved for clarity and completeness as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>1- The methodology is briefly mentioned but could include details on the sample size and statistical tools used. Eg, Logistic regression was used to assess the determinants of VL suppression.</li><li>2- <b>Some sentences are incomplete eg:</b> A total of 9727..... were retrieved and analyzed, The female..... better suppression (70.8%) when compared to the male. Patients with secondary education had .....viral load suppression (38.7%) when compared to the other levels of level of education. Two thirds of the patients on antiretroviral therapy for ten years had <b>more better</b> suppression <b>rate</b> (65%) when compared to those less than ten years on ART.</li><li>3- The implication of the result is not stated at the conclusion of the abstract.</li><li>4- <b>Study Design:</b> A retrospective cross-sectional study was conducted at the Federal Medical Centre, Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria, from January 2020 to December 2024</li></ul>	All the issues raised addressed
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound overall. The study design (retrospective cross-sectional study), the large sample size, the statistical method (Multivariate logistic regression) and the comparison of findings were just appropriate for the study. However, there are areas that could be improved to ensure robustness and scientific accuracy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>1- the limitations of being retrospective and hospital-based does not discuss how these may have influenced the results (e.g., potential biases or incomplete data).</li><li>2- Although ethical approval is mentioned, additional details on patient confidentiality and data handling would enhance transparency.,</li><li>3- Discussion of Findings:</li></ul> <p>Some findings, such as the higher viral suppression among females, are mentioned but not sufficiently explored. Additional discussion on possible biological, behavioural, or sociocultural factors would enrich the analysis.</p>	All the issues raised addressed
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some references are more than five years old, with some dating back to 2015 or earlier (e.g., Volberding, 2011; UNAIDS, 2017). While these may be foundational, they should be supplemented with more recent studies. Update with studies published between 2020 and 2023, particularly those from high-impact journals or global organizations.	All the issues raised had been adressed
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally understandable but some phrases need improvement: Several sentences are grammatically incorrect or poorly constructed. For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Original:</b> "Human Immunodeficiency Syndrome remain one of the world's most significant public health challenges affecting about 38 million people globally."<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Revised: "Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) remains one of the world's most significant public health challenges, affecting approximately 38 million people globally."</li></ul></li><li>• <b>Original:</b> "The age, sex, first line regimen and duration on ART were independent predictors of viral load suppression."<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Revised: "Age, sex, first-line regimen, and ART duration were identified as independent predictors of viral load suppression."</li></ul></li></ul> <p><b>Inconsistent Terminology:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The terms "viral load suppression," "viral suppression," and "virological suppression" are used interchangeably without clarification, potentially confusing readers.</li></ul>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is good and need some improvement.	

[Review Form 3](#)

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