



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_7014
Title of the Manuscript:	Sociodemographic and clinical correlates of HSV2 infection among antenatal clinic attendees in Benin
Type of the Article	Research paper

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 is no doubt a good study. However, a few observations were made which in my opinion MUST be addressed. 1. I suspect that the author didn't sight or read most of the cited references. The internet has provided access to information including references and opportunity to request for reprints via e-mail. Many of the 2013 refs were only used as sources for older refs and were not cited and listed. Check out 2. No consistent reference format; evidence that these were copied and pasted from sources. 3. Refs 18 and 20 may not have complied with Journal format – Check out please 4. Refs 1,2,7 for underlines? 5. Refs fully cited as in 6 below do not need URL 6. Remove, month vol. or pp. where applicable and follow correct format - eg 2004;120(2):106-110 NOT 2004;120(2):106-10.; Always provide last page where available 7. Ref 28 kindly provide doi: 8. Too many short paragraphs under Results section 9. Acronyms used must be written in full at first use or mention; non-scientists may find this article interesting as well. Once a terminology has been used and acronym provided, kindly stick to the use of the acronym subsequent to avoid unnecessary repetitions; e.g., sexually transmitted infection/s (STI/s)	All the in-puts are well appreciated. 1-7: several modifications have been made to the references. 8: results section as been modified 9: noted
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 21 – To read Counselling and testing for HIV were also carried out	Line 21: Modification effected Line 61/62: modification effected throughout



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 61/62 – Punctuations, particularly full stop after [refs]. This is inconsistent throughout the body of the manuscript. It should be [] . and NOT . [] Check out Line 71 – To read °C not °C Click on insert and go to symbol Line 73 – To read Milano, Italy Line 88 – To read 18 to 44 years and the mean age was Line 89 – To read Majority () was Line 98, 113, 119, 121, 124, 130, 134 among others – To read (). Line 124 – Occurrence of the repeated; delete one Line 141 – To read Only a small proportion Line 159 – To read /[] Provide a space between the last word and [refs] all where applicable in the manuscript Line 164 – [refs] to read [refs]. or , Punctuation; not consistent Line 165/167 – Previous findings/reports cannot corroborate the present; the reverse is the case. Line 171 – Unfaithfulness does not arise in unmarried status; unmarried is not a relationship either but a status Line 172 – Replace “is corroborated by” with agrees with Line 174 – Replace “associated poverty” with associated consequences Line 184 – To read in this present study or in our study Line 189 – To read had a history of Line 193 – To read Close to a half Line 196 – .[] Replace clinically with clinical Line 199 – Replace HSV_2 with HSV-2 Use of acronyms Line 200 – a) Do not italicize spp.; there must be a full stop after spp irrespective of whether it ends a sentence or not. b) were significantly to read was	document Line 71: modified Line 73:modified Line 88: modified in 87 Line 89:modified Lines 98, etc: parenthesis before full stop effected throughout the document Line 124: modified in 95 Line 124 corrected in 97 Line 141 modified 99 Line 159 modified in the manuscript Line 164 modified in the entire manuscript 165/167 modified in 122 Line 171 Thanks. That was down to earth. Modification in line 125 Line 172 /174 the lines deleted Line 184 modified in 135 Line 189 modified in 142 Line 196 modified in 148/149 Line 199 modified in 152 Line 200 modified in 155 Line 203 modified 156 Line 204 modified in 157
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	significantly Line 203 – To read /[]; bacteria vaginosis to read bacterial vaginosis Line 204 – Remove “in a previous reports” If authors wish to retain, then it must read “in previous reports” since more than one refs were cited. Line 209 – /[]	
Optional/General comments	This is a good study with equally data collected germane to the specific environment, nation, and the world at large. However, there is need for serious editorial attention in terms of language and keeping to Journal format.	