



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This data is potentially interesting and public health relevant. However, the manuscript has to be dramatically improved before publication is possible. General: Language needs improvement. Many sentences in the manuscript are difficult to understand. Introduction: This needs to be made more scholarly. There are many strong (and repeated) statements, but it should be made clearer what type of scientific evidence back up these statements. Please also provide mechanisms why persons with disability should have more sexual risk behaviour. Methods: Sampling method needs to be better described. Where were interviews performed? How were persons approached? Was any compensation given? Sentence about origins of questionnaire is not clear. Measurements need to be better described – was the reference period the past 12 months for all measures or only for some? Why? It should be made clearer what is the main aim and research question. Only relevant tables should be presented.	Language edition was done by expert to improve the manuscript based on the comment given. Based on the comment given to the introduction to improve the manuscript the authors did their effort to do so. The sampling method was described clearly in the manuscript. There was nothing compensation given for the participants of the study. The questionnaire used was adopted from reviewed literatures. The measurement technique was rewritten to make clear for the reader. The main aim of any study could be indicated either with objective or research question, the aim of the study was included in the study.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Where there persons with mental disability included? Results Provide confidence intervals for prevalence (if this is the main outcome of the study). Discussion Needs to be better grounded in the data. For example, the motivation for the statement that ‘this finding evidences that people with disabilities in the study area were more vulnerable for HIV/AIDS’ is unclear. The prevalence obtained should be compared to the prevalence of comparable measures in the general population in Ethiopia. This is more interesting than comparisons to persons with disability in other countries. Possible mechanisms behind findings should be discussed. New results should not be presented in the discussion. MOST IMPORTANT: methodological limitations need to be thoroughly discussed.	Result: The 95% confidence interval for the prevalence was included in the manuscript as per the comment given. The authors explored the magnitude and the factors that affect sexual risk behaviours among disabled individuals and based on the findings it was tried to say something about vulnerability to HIV/AIDS and other STI. The reason to declare that disabled people were vulnerable to HIV was because of the sexual behaviour that they have, it is clear that risky sexual behaviours are the main mechanisms for HIV transmission. The authors tried to google on the magnitude and factors associated with risky sexual behaviour among disability but there is no data to find. The main limitation of the study was included in the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		