



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMMR_16555
Title of the Manuscript:	Survey of knowledge and source of information relating to reproduction and sexually transmitted infections including human immunodeficiency virus among senior secondary schools students in a military barracks in Nigeria
Type of the 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This paper is not well written with many unclear sentences. The results in the abstracts could be written more explicitly. There is no mention of HIV in the abstract.</li> <li>2. The questionnaires used in this study were said to be pretested and validated. Did the investigators mean to say piloted?? If the instruments were pretested and validated in other studies this should be clear. Line 135-136 seems to refer to the pretested questionnaires in relevant literature but this is not clear in the introduction.</li> <li>3. Sections 2.1 and 2.3 are mixed as the population is explained in both sections. Section 2.1 should refer to the study setting and 2.3 the study population.</li> <li>4. Section 2.4 is not clear. In line 101 it's not necessary to include 'p' in the sentence but explain what 'p' is in the formula. 'q' is=0.48 but 'q' is not referenced anywhere. 'nf' is also not well explained.</li> <li>5. It is not clear whether the investigators are using simple random sampling or stratified random sampling. There seem to have been some control on the allotment of girls vs boys classes to control for gender. This is not clear.</li> <li>6. Since there are many types of 'media' the</li> </ol>	<p>This has been corrected.</p> <p>Pretest was done, not pilot. Questions were drawn from relevant literature and then pretested on students of similar class in the Sister Navy Barracks Secondary School.</p> <p>This has been done. See pages 95-99.</p> <p>q= complementary proportion of p, i.e. the proportion of not sexually active = 1-p [15] ; d = desired precision at 5%= 0.05; z = a constant at 95% confidence interval z = (1.96). Therefore, p = 0.52, while q= 1-p = 0.48</p> <p>Then a conversion was made using the</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>investigators should consider stratifying the type of media being referenced.</p> <p>7. The title of the paper makes reference to HIV but it's not clear whether the questionnaire had specific questions on HIV or it was all lumped into STIs.</p>	<p>formula for the calculation of <math>n_f</math>, =</p> <p>minimum sample size for populations less than 10,000,</p> <p>sex into males and females</p> <p>This has been effected. See pages 20, 181, 244.</p> <p>This has been effected in the title.</p>
--	---	---



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>Line 7: separate into 2 words 'soughtinformation'  Line 18: remove the word 'respectively'.  Line 19: if possible, specify type of media.  Separate into 2 words 'soughtfrom'.  Line 20: not clear the findings in males and females  Line 21: specify the type of very good knowledge? Both reproduction and STIs? ?HIV?  Line 23: separate into 2 words femaleshad'. Specify the type of knowledge that males had.  Line 24: separate into 2 words 'overallknowledge'.  Line 25: Is the interventions including peer education a finding from the research or inferred? This conclusion may not be in line with the findings of this study.  Line 28: Add HIV as key word.  Line 49: If necessary use STIs and HIV as abbreviations  Line 52: correct 'socio- cultural' spacing.  Lines 56-57: Sentence not clear.  Additional background should include literature around the unique setting of this study: institutionalization in barracks.  Line 87: Use full name of abbreviation 'SS1-3' first time  Line 108: separate into 2 words 'sizefor'.  Line 140: correct 'socio- demographic' spacing  Line 140-143: please clarify the sections in the questionnaire.  Section 2.8: The response rate was 100%, is there any specific reason why it was this?</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>		