

Manuscript: “Stigma as a Challenge To Adherence To Antiretroviral Therapy Among People Living With Hiv/Aids In Nigeria – A Review”

Submitted: 26 October 2020

Accepted: 07 December 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: Okuku Mary Obidiya

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n36p128

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Jane Wanjira,
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Joseph Chukwu

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Jane Wanjira	
University/Country: Kenyatta University, Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Stigma As A Challenge To Adherence To Antiretroviral Therapy Among People	

Living With HIV/AIDS In Nigeria – A Review
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1144/20
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. <i>The title is clear and adequate.</i>	5
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. <i>The object and the results are clear. The method need to be expanded to bring out the methods used to select specific papers. The abstract also need to show the linkage between the different aspects evaluated in the study: legal as well as the practice.</i>	4
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Some repetitions are included in the abstract. In the introduction there are a few grammatical errors – these persons refuse getting tested.</i> <i>There is the use of ‘also’ and other conjunctions such as However to start paragraphs where the thoughts are not linked.</i> <i>Paragraph two on page 5, this should be revisited – the language is contradictory</i>	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The method is explained but there is need for explanation on why these specific studies were selected – the justification for the choice of those and not any other.</i> <i>Revisit the review as the study focuses on Nigeria and some of the studies identified from other countries including South Africa.</i>	4
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3.5

<p>(Please insert your comments)</p> <p><i>The results are clear but more support on the cultural context should be used to justify the variations</i></p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3.5
<p><i>The conclusions are accurate but more should be included to support the recommended methods of removing stigma</i></p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<p>(Please insert your comments)</p> <p><i>These are comprehensive</i></p>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is a good paper but you need to provide more contextual aspects that shape the behaviour of community members especially when the subject under discussion is viewed as a taboo. This would provide a strong support for review of stigma