



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	2014_I-SRR_10888
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge and perception of sexual health education and condom use among STI patients in India
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	A good study that compared knowledge of STI, HIV/AIDS of two different treatment groups and also explored the perceptions of adolescent sexuality education in schools. The sampling system was a multistage, cross sectional and descriptive. This needs to be stated. Recommendation must be removed from the body of discussion. The limitations to this study should be stated in the methodology rather than in the discussion.	Now modified according to suggestion. It is international standard and reputed researchers suggestion that study limitations including methodological limitations should be placed in discussion. Does the editor of this journal suggest changing the standard system? Then we can put method limitation in methods section. Remember the authors are well-reputed international experts and published more than 100 papers.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It should be stated that the study is a comparative study between two groups.	It is already stated in different way: ".....HIV/AIDS and condom use among men and women who have been medically treated and not treated



SDI Review Form 1.6

		for STIs.....” Page 2: Line 61 -63. However, we have now added “This is a comparative study between two groups, unsafe sex victims and non-victims”.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		