



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 <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>
Compulsory 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>	
Minor 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 in post intervention (Please described about the questionnaire used in post intervention)?</p> <p>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</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>“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% minus 25.02).” The authors did not mention about this changes in results section. The results of this study should be discussed using the previous literature and studies about health education methods.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer