



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6102
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE OF SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED INFECTIONS (STIs) INCLUDING HIV/AIDS AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	Introduction Introduction and problem statement must be merged. Materials and methods Materials and method must be present as heading with sub heading of study area, period and design; population (source and study population); sample size and sampling techniques; study variables; data collection; data analysis; data quality control; ethical clearance. Some of the above issues were present in your manuscripts but not clearly stated. For example the study focused on undergraduate students from Abuja, but nothing stated about number undergraduate departments and students, why you select eleven departments? Why not compare your results between each department? How did you calculate sample size(400 students)? How did you allocate it to each department and get each participant in department? Where did you get questionnaire (adopted or prepared by yourself) and list of variables collected? Method analysis manually or by software? Your result presented only as descriptive. Generally material and method requires major revision. Result and discussion Knowledge of respondents on HIV/AIDS (91%) is higher than on STI (87.4%), why? HIV/AIDS is not STI. Even what type of knowledge did you assessed: about transmission, prevention or both? Because it is difficult to generalize knowledge by asking single question did heard about HIV/AIDS or STI? Similarly how did categorized the respondent knowledge about specific	Introduction and problem statement has been merged Materials and methods has been presented as heading with some other subheadings such as: Study area, study population, sample size determination, sampling technique, data collection, data analyses, etc The questionnaire was self designed and the nature of variables collected were stated in the manuscript The departments were selected through stratified random sampling while student Participation and their level of study was by simple random sampling Results and Discussion The knowledge of HIV/AIDS is higher than that of STIs probably because of the level of publication given to HIV/AIDS in the different information media The type of knowledge assessed was that of types of STIs, routes of transmission, preventive



SDI Review Form 1.6

	STI? All of your participants are non health students. In addition, there is repetition of result in statement as presented in figure or tables, why not you highlight major or peculiar finding and you can ask your reader to refer from table or figure for the rest. Some values in statements are different from the one inside the figure or table. The discussion needs more comparison with other studies and detailed justification for the differences	measures etc Some Specific types of STIs were itemised Repetition of results has been corrected in the manuscript More comparisons are now made with other similar studies in different parts of Africa and the world
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author did not follow the manuscripts preparation format. For example unstructured abstract which lacks study area, period ,design and sample size ; introduction and problem statement as separate title; reference citations not by number system . There are parts absent like competing interest, authors contribution and ethical approval	The manuscript has been corrected to conform with the manuscripts preparation format
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author should follow guideline and add other similar studies for comparison purpose.	This has been done in the manuscript