



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMMR_14539
Title of the Manuscript:	Sexual Behaviour of Secondary School Students in Port Harcourt

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments						
<p>Dear Authors, I am very interested in your research and I believe it show great finding for concerned bodies. I recommend you see the comment I made, I believe they are critical and hope the study will be published.</p> <p>Page 3 starting from line 16 The sample size was estimated using a single proportion sample size formulae by considering the following parameters: Prevalence of _____63% reported by Owolabi et al[8], 95% CI, and 5% of margin of error, with 1.5 Design effect and 20% for the non-response rate. Considering resource, a total number of 1080 students were recruited for this study.....</p> <p>Page 4, Line 10, it is better to say, The questioners were adopted from the sexual behaviour section of the 2013 Youth Risk Behaviour Survey questionnaire.</p> <p>Page 4 starting from line 11 Data were entered into SPSS Version 20.0 statistical software. Univariate analysis was done to describe the socio-demographic characteristics and Sexual behavior of the study participants. To identify independently associated factors, multiple logistic regression model was produced by having sexual intercourse as outcome variable. All explanatory variables that were associated with the outcome variable in the bivariate analysis ($P = \leq 0.05$) and variables consistently found to be associated with occurrence of sexual intercourse in other studies were included in the logistic regression model. Odds Ratio (OR) and their 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) were calculated.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Result section</p> <p>Your table 1 should be discussing socio demographic and sexual behavior of the study participants.(see the sample table)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Variables</th><th>Frequency (percentage)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Sex</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Male</td><td>247(48.8%)</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Variables	Frequency (percentage)	Sex		Male	247(48.8%)	<p>The corrections have been effected.</p> <p>The correction has been made in the methodology</p> <p>Corrections have been effected in methodology.</p> <p>Corrections have been effected.</p>
Variables	Frequency (percentage)						
Sex							
Male	247(48.8%)						



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

Female		259 (51.2%)			
I don't see the difference between Table 1 and Table 2 in your manuscript, in addition you will merge/add your table 3 output to make one self explanatory table.(see the sample)					
Variables	Had sexual intercourse		P-value	COR(95% C.I)	AOR(95% C.I)
	yes	No			
Sex			0.28		-
Male	128(51.8%)	119(48.2%)		0.82 (0.58-1.17)	
Female	122(47.1%)	137(52.9%)		1	
Religion			0.19		-
Orthodox	176(49.0%)	183(51.0%)		0 .57 (0.29-1.13)	
Muslim	49(45.8%)	58(54.2%)		0.50 (0.24-1.06)	
Protestant	25(62.5%)	15(37.5%)		1	
Educational status			0.0001		
Illiterate	57(35.0%)	106(65.0%)		0.85(0.02-0.29)	0.10(0.03-0.38)
Read and Write	90(46.4%)	104(53.6%)		0.14(0.04-0.47)	0.16(0.04-0.57)
Elementary	26(60.5%)	17(39.5%)		0.24(0.06-0.94)	0.34(0.08-1.37)
High school	58(69.0%)	26(31.0%)		0.35(0.09-1.29)	0.50(0.13-1.9)
above 12	19(86.4%)	3(13.6%)		1	1

Page 8

Be careful while looking output in the SPSS analysis and your interpretation of the result in table 3. For example in the logistic regression table 3. Those who

The tables have been merged.

The corrections have been made



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

Watching Pornographic Movies had lesser odd of having sexual intercourse than their counter part (meaning Watching Pornographic Movies is protective). This is the opposite of what you have been discussing **(result and discussion part)** in the whole paper, similar care to the other variables too.