



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	2013_ISRR_6850
Title of the Manuscript:	Sexually transmitted diseases: Knowledge and perceived prevalence of symptoms in 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The author need to begin his abstract with some background information on the subject under study in the given study area. 2. The author needs to clearly write his conclusion and recommendations that need to be done specifically based on the findings this study rather than mentioning general truth in abstract, conclusion and recommendation sections. 3. In the method section: The author better to state some pertinent points about the study areas. What type of study design used? According to this study, the author stated that	Background information was added in the abstract. A clearer conclusion and recommendation was added It was added in the “procedures” section in the method, regarding the type of study .



SDI Review Form 1.6

	317 male and 698 female students were completed the questionnaire and included in the study. Why this happened, is selection of the study population purposive, that means, is that purposively the questionnaire sent to the email of the students? Or is that random? If the selection was random and the questionnaire was sent randomly to the email of the students, how the number of female study participants is more than two times than males? Otherwise, the author better clearly state the number and proportion of male and female students in the universities included in the study. So that the reader could understand that really female students are more in number in the given universities than males, then your sampling technique come true. 4. The author said nothing about whether	It was explained in the “participants” section that the selection of participants was non-probabilistic (purposively) and that in fact female student are more in number than male students.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	or not pre-test was done and the necessary changes were done to the questionnaire before the actual study, better to included in both abstract and method sections. Dear author, please try to include the type of statistical package that you used for this study. Besides, try to clearly state the data processing and analysis techniques both in the abstract and method sections. In the method section, starting from line 83 or “the sample consists..... up to the end of table 1 or line 98, should be put in the result section because this is not a part of method, rather is part of finding or result. 5. In the discussion section: from line 228 to 238 is not a part of discussion, may be you can put it after your discussion as limitation of study. Discussion of study should start with discussion of	This information was included in the “instruments” section and in the “abstract”. Information regarding the statistical package was included (SPSS) in the “procedures” section. The statistical package used was SPSS (version 19) and analytic methods used were univariate descriptive statistics, two-sample t-tests, analysis of variance, and linear-regression analyses. Regarding this comment, we believe that the sample characterization should be in the method because it was not our aim in the study to characterize the participants, therefore should not be considered a result. Asked for changes in this topic were implemented.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	main findings of the study. 6. What is the operational definition for knowledge according to this study? The author mentioned inadequate knowledge in different sections of this study, but nothing was said, what is adequate or inadequate knowledge to consider these university students have inadequate knowledge. According to your finding the university students have inadequate knowledge on the topic but you should give strong recommendation to the government or any concerned body to increase the knowledge of university students. Your finding says female students were about two times more knowledgeable than their male counter parts, you need to justify where the difference came? Is that may be due to your inappropriate sample	It was explained in the inadequacy of knowledge was determined by the number of correct answers (in the “discussion” section). These results were justified in the discussion section.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	sampling and sample size determination? Or something else?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Grammatical issues : 1. The aim of this study is..... change it in to the aim of this study was.....	Changed!
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		