



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>A lot of grammatical rework has to be done in this manuscript.</p> <p>Regarding sample size, minimum sample size needed for each method should be mentioned together with power and type I error used in the study.</p> <p>The authors should describe about ethical issues such as approval for conducting research, voluntary participation and informed consent.</p>	Done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Comma sign “,” should be used whenever necessary. Eg. Line 73, “Among various methods of disease prevention,”</p> <p>In introduction part, from line 78 – 85, the facts are confusing because of grammar. So, sentences should be reconstructed.</p> <p>In material and methods, Line 95 – 96, the details of how the researcher conducted stratified random sampling to get the sample of 20 students for each technique should be described.</p> <p>Did the researcher test reliability and validity of questionnaire to assess knowledge? If so, please described about that. Is that the same questionnaire used</p>	Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>in post intervention (Please described about the questionnaire used in post intervention)? How did the researcher give the score for knowledge items (30 items)? Please describe it.</p> <p>The calculation for “% increase in knowledge score” should be described.</p> <p>Research hypotheses should be modified as “There is no difference in the overall knowledge score of adolescent students about HIV/AIDS between pre intervention and post intervention” “There is no difference in the knowledge of adolescent students about HIV/AIDS between pre intervention and post intervention of different techniques of health education methods”</p> <p>Results Line 129, “.....39% of female were taken.....” Line 132, “20% were Brahmins” Line 129, “61% of male”</p> <p>Table 1, The rows about total in the table should be removed.</p> <p>Line 164, “differences in the pre-intervention and post intervention mean knowledge scores”</p> <p>Discussion, There are a lot of grammatical errors. Sentences should be reconstructed.</p> <p>It is confusing about “Therefore, we can say that educational methods have been able to enhance the knowledge after intervention by 13% more (37.99%</p>	<p>I have corrected entire things as far from my knowledge..</p>
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>minus 25.02).” The authors did not mention about this changes in results section.</p> <p>The results of this study should be discussed using the previous literature and studies about health education methods.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The authors did not declare about approval, voluntary participation or informed consent.</p> <p>The authors did not declare about competing interest</p>	