



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Applied Science &amp; Technology</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abstract – there are several grammatical errors in the abstract (e.g. line 7 – were should be 'was'). The sentence 'Questionnaire were used....' could be better rendered as 'A questionnaire was used as a survey tool...' There is unnecessary capitalization of words such as 'Gonorrhoea and 'Syphilis' (line 15, both which can be written without capitalization). The words 'fever off and on' (line 20) should be standardized with the rest of the manuscript where it was written either as 'fever on and off' (line 52,53) or 'fever off and on' (line 198 and figure 4).</li> <li>2. Introduction – unnecessary capitalization of disease conditions or words (line 47-48, see also line 141); Line 52 (Lower); Line 173 (Mother). Grammar error (line 51, includes should be 'include')</li> <li>3. Study area – the abbreviation FCT was not expanded before use.</li> <li>4. Results – I suggest the author/s refer to their figures by number rather than writing 'The figure below' (line 119) because the figures placement in a published journal may not necessary immediately follow the preceding paragraph. The change should be effected for the rest of the figures and tables.</li> <li>5. The text should not repeat what has already</li> </ol>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>been detailed in the tables (line 130-133, with references to table 1; see also line 159-163 with reference to figure 3).</p> <p>6. It is peculiar that the author/s have chosen not to comment on their findings under the broad heading of 'Discussion' but instead, has chosen to comment and reference other studies immediately after each figure/table has been presented. Unless this is the style of the journal, it is not ideal. I suggest elaboration under a the title 'Discussion' to be included and results presented per-se without comments/elaboration under 'Results'.</p> <p>7. Table 2 is misleading as it implies that sharing toilet, eating utensils, witchcraft and kissing are routes for HIV transmission. Perhaps the author/s can make this distinction clearly in the table as well as in the discussion text (line 185 – 186: Seven (2%) mistakenly agreed that the STIs....).</p> <p>8. The 'deluge of intervention' alluded to by the author/s (line 72 -73) was not elaborated by the author/s although the conclusion was that these measures were successful in raising greater awareness (line 23-24). I suggest a paragraph be dedicated to briefly describe what are these interventional strategies.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	The manuscript is interesting and the findings would be useful for local policy makers.	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kwee Choy Koh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Department of Internal Medicine, International Medical University, Malaysia</b>