



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International STD Research &amp; Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_I-SRR_10961
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSING HEALTH EDUCATION TECHNIQUES IN ENHANCING THE KNOWLEDGE OF HIV/AIDS AMONG ADOLESCENTS
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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This kind of study demands that there should be a control group where no form of health education is administered during intervention. Although the abstract shows that a control group exist but this didn't reflect in the main body of the work. This study has no control group. All 5 groups in this study had one form of health education or the other administered to them.</li> <li>• Authors did not show whether permission was sort from respondents or not.</li> <li>• Under table II, the 'Mean + Std Deviation' column did not reflect any unit. Are the figures under it in percentages or what? Indicate it on the table. The same observation goes for table III.</li> <li>• How did the authors arrive at the values under '% increase in knowledge score' on table II? Same observation goes for table III.</li> <li>• Under table IV, state the exert p values for poster/pamphlets, video and participatory lecture and remove &lt;.001</li> <li>• Also under the same table, correct the p value of lecture from 001 to .001.</li> <li>• Under the discussion, line 176, 37.99% minus 25.02% was indicated under t-value on table II, why then is then referred to as percentages here? T values are never in percentages.</li> <li>• This study should be compared with previous studies under the discussion. Authors should search for previous studies and compare. Example of such</li> </ul>	I have corrected entire things as far from my knowledge...



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>work that could be used as comparism: Muhammad Buhari Abu-Saeed and Kamaldeen Abu-Saeed. Attitudinal Changes Using Peer Education Training in the Prevention of HIV/AIDS: A Case Study of Youths in North Central Nigeria. Advanced Pharmaceutical Bulletin. 2013; 3(1): 45-50. DOI: <a href="https://doi.org/10.5681/apb.2013.008">10.5681/apb.2013.008</a> (Available online at <a href="http://apb.tbzmed.ac.ir">http://apb.tbzmed.ac.ir</a>). Authors can search for others.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The analysis of the result of the present study and discussion of the analysis is generally not convincing.</li> <li>• The Vancouver style of referencing should be used to rewrite reference 2. Move the date (March 2012) to the end of the reference.</li> <li>• Authors should read up the author's guideline for manuscript writing and tidy up the entire work by following the guidelines strictly.</li> </ul>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction: Line 63, write out the full meaning of CSW</li> <li>• Objective: Line 90 should be re written as ' to assess the <b>various</b> health education methods in enhancing the knowledge of HIV/AIDS among adolescents.'</li> <li>• Line 152, authors should rephrase the statement as '...and participatory lecture groups were 60 each...'</li> </ul>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>Good attempt especially the various forms of health education used as intervention.</p>	