



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	2014_I-SRR_12181
Title of the Manuscript:	Features of Sexual Behavior of University Students in a Country with High HIV Prevalence: A Qualitative Study
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 <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	Introduction is spelled wrong in manuscript and in sect #63 beginning with Specific..... is not a complete sentence as well as #64. In #53 knowledge is capitalized and should not be. #53 there should be an explanation as to what "inappropriate "" is. The Discussion portion should not just be a repeat of the findings to be a discussion section it should begin with line 285 and all the information prior to this should not be the discussion. When these corrections are made it is a good qualitative study. Comments received from email	The first four comments are accepted and corrected. Regarding the last comment, The discussion is not the repetition of prior information. As recommended in several literatures, the first paragraph of the discussion section was started by highlighting the key findings. From 2nd paragraph onwards, however, emphasis was given to compare our results with others report.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		