



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMMR_14539
Title of the Manuscript:	Sexual Behaviour of Secondary School Students in Port Harcourt
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	<p>The paper is good but I do not think it adds knowledge to the existing literature. However, the following comments are of utmost importance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the abstract, the author mentions multistage sampling; but this was not elaborated in the methods section. -In the introduction section, words should be written in full for the first time, and subsequently abbreviated (SSA, STDs, STIs, etc) -We need more on sampling technique -Chi square is not used to test significance, but to test association between variables. <p>Reliability and validity of the questionnaire were not mentioned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -References 9, 11 and 23 are obsolete. -The results should be discussed in the light of some limitations. -After revising the paper as per the comments, it should be sent to a language expert for thorough editing. <p>If there any competing interest issue, please clarify.</p>	<p>The sampling process has been explained in the methodology.</p> <p>The corrections have been effected.</p> <p>References 9, 11 and 23 have been removed.</p> <p>The revised paper has been edited by a language expert.</p> <p>The authors have declared that no competing interest exists.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		