



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International STD Research & Reviews</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_I-SRR_10946
Title of the Manuscript:	SYPHILIS AND HUMAN IMMUNODEFICIENCY VIRUS CO-INFECTION AMONG PREGNANT WOMEN IN NIGERIA: PREVALENCE AND TREND
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	[127] "People in Ido - Osi cherish farming, education, trading and practicing majorly Christianity religion. [should be removed] [131] spell out 1913 since it starts the sentence [143-145] are a repeat remove and start by describing demographics There is no mention of the statistical methods used for your analysis in methods	It has been deleted as suggested by the reviewer It has been spelt out
	The Literature Review in my opinion is lengthy and can be summarized and should be shortened.	No literature Review, I guess the reviewer wanted to comment on the introduction, if it is the introduction, it has been reviewed and be shortened in a way to give light to the research work
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		