



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	2014_I-SRR_8918
Title of the Manuscript:	Risky Sexual behaviours and Associated Factors among People with Disabilities in Dessie City, Northeast Ethiopia
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Introduction • Very weak background. There is the need to review more studies in this field giving wider perspectives from other African countries apart from South Africa. There are a few studies from Nigeria by Aderemi et al. Please search the literature • The introduction is deficient in available evidence from Ethiopia. There are pockets of unpublished studies from Ethiopia e.g., Ethiopian Centre for Disability and Development, MOLSA, Handicap International, and a few others. A few published ones are also available online e.g., Alemu & Fantahun, Population Council • The cited references 6 & 7 on lines 52-58 did not compare people with disabilities with the general population. So why are the author(s) comparing with the non-disabled	The comment given was accepted and the possible correction was done regarding making strong the background of the manuscript. The problem was there is scarcity of information on risky sexual behaviours for these disadvantaged people. Thanks for the comment given here on the references 6 and 7; however these references are on people with disabilities. I think you can google and see. The comment was accepted and the correction was done between “people with disabilities” and “physical disabilities”. As to the authors understanding whether



SDI Review Form 1.6

	people or the general population - Line 56: do not confuse people with disabilities with people with physical disabilities. The cited reference does not report on people with physical disabilities specifically - Be consistent. Choose between ‘persons with disabilities’ or ‘people with disabilities’ Data collection instrument and data collection - What theoretical framework was used to develop the questionnaire? - Overall, this study was not based on any particular conceptual or theoretical framework. Risky sexual behaviours were only compared with socio-behavioural characteristics. Behaviours are not only dependent on socio-behavioural factors, but are strongly influenced by knowledge, attitudes, self-efficacy, significant others, intention, environmental barriers, access to information. The fact that this study was not conceptualized on any behavioural model is a major weakness. Therefore, I consider the findings inconclusive and	physical disabilities or any other form of disability mentioned, all are a group of disability. That is why our study included all people with disabilities regardless of the type of disability they have in the disability association in the study area As the comment given people with disability was replaced with persons with disabilities throughout the manuscript. The questionnaire was developed by
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	unreliable. Language/Grammar • Additionally, there is a need for major language editing for it to be published References • Incomplete information e.g., 8 & 12 • Author names style is inconsistent e.g., in 7 & 9, first names come before last names • In some other places, first names are fully written, whereas at other times this is not so	reviewing different papers with risky sexual behaviours though most are not on people with disability. The study particularly focused on sexual behaviours and socio demographic characteristics. The authors believe that knowledge deficient and attitudinal problems are insignificant for risky sexual behaviours in the current situation of Ethiopia.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Methods and Materials • Participants: ○ What is the age range of the participants? ○ Replace all appearances of ‘disabled associations’ with Disabled People’s Organisations (DPOs) ○ Lines 68-70: ‘trauma, genetics or disease that limit mobility’ are not types of disabilities. Better to say ‘physical, hearing, vision disabilities’. Be sure to list all the disability types represented in your sample ○ Describe the sampling strategy that was utilised to recruit participants? • Data collection instrument and data collection ○ Describe the constructs that were explored in the questionnaire. Specific questions come under the	What is the importance of mentioning the age of participants in the method section? The authors believe that the age of respondents will be mentioned in the finding section of report or manuscript. Disability associations in the area are associations in which people with disability are included and get help. So we prefer “people with disability” rather than “Disabled People’s Organisations” The sampling method of the study was stated in the manuscript. You can see it. The sampling method used in the study is all inclusive. The questionnaires were prepared based on reviewed literatures which are cited as indicated in the manuscript. The participants of the study in the study area are some are illiterate and some have some educational level because of this, though the issue is sensitive and personal we couldn’t used self administrated rather we used the interview administrated. The necessary changes or modifications were done on words that were not understood when asked and skip patterns of the questionnaire was done after pretest
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	constructs, but your audience need to know which constructs the questions represent e.g., attitudes, knowledge, self-efficacy etc - o How was the questionnaire administered? Self-administered or administered by interviewers - o Lines 80-81: specifically, what ‘necessary changes were done to the questionnaire’? • Measurements - o Are these all the questions asked in the questionnaire? Apart from sexual behaviours, what other constructs were explored in the questionnaire? - o What were the dependent and independent variables? • Ethical considerations - o Was the sensitive nature of the study discussed with participants	of our questionnaire. Dependent variable is our main variable measured and affected by several predictor variables. In our study risky sexual behaviour is dependent variable which was affected by several factors. However, independent variables are variables that are affecting the dependent variable. So these independent variables are predictor variables of the dependent one. Of course informed oral consent was obtained from each study participants before the commencement of data collection. It was told to every member of our study subjects can refuse to answer any questions that they didn’t wanted to do so and could stop any time that they want. However, it was told to them that their genuine responses have paramount help on the investigation of the issue.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	before they were recruited? - o Were participants made aware of the fact that participation was voluntary and that they can opt out at any time? Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents • In line 75, the sample size is given as 442. Why is it 412 here (line 126)? Please review. If the the total number of members of the DPOs was 442, and only 412 participated in the study, then that has to be clearly stated in line 75 • Line 138: replace ‘were physically handicapped’ with ‘had physical disabilities’	The total number of people with disabilities in all disability associations in the study area is 442, and the sampling procedure as it was mentioned all inclusive. However, 30 questionnaires were not complete because of discontinuation of respondents to participate in the study, resulting response rate of 93.2%.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		