SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

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**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**1.)** Information on sexual behaviour in youth is important for the design of HIV prevention programs. Investigations on this topic are always welcome. The main constraint of the study is that no adequate or sufficient use of statistics was made. The author have (SPSS 20!), but in fact, provide statistics that are so basic that one could do them on a simple 2-$ calculator. I suggest that publication be postponed until appropriate statistics are provided, e.g. **multivariate logistic regressions**, with an adjustment for all important variables. A variety of dependent variables could be investigated, for example 'having has sex', 'having had involuntary sex', et cetera pp; It seems interesting to know the influence of all other factors on these dependent variables. Finally, this approach would require that the paper be re-written, with the 'newly' gained findings being **presented properly.** **2.)** The authors state that serious sexual harassment had taken place. However, this issue is not addressed properly nor is there an analysis provided of factors associated with this and which effect this might have. When re-doing the statistical analysis I would recommend that this issue be dealt with. **Chapter Materials and Methods:**	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	Explain how the "random selection procedure" was carried out. **How many students were asked to participate?** **To how many parents was the consent form distributed and how many agreed.** **Chapter Results:** "43.1% students admitted that someone had touched their private parts without their permission – these figures should be given **separately for the two sexes**."	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	**ALL:** **1.) information reported by the students merely is presented as facts throughout the manuscript.** **This ought to be rectified.** **Some examples (among various others):** **ABSTRACT, Results, Line 2:** **(i) Reads now:** "449(42.9%) students ~~have~~ had sex at least once" **Should read:** "449(42.9%) students reported having had sex at least once" **(ii) Reads now:** "More females ~~had~~ had sex compared to the males (χ_2=7.357,P=.007)" **Should read:** "More females reported having sex compared to the males (χ_2=7.357,P=.007)" **(iii) Reads now:** **RESULTS, Para 2** **(i) Reads now:** "… (36.2%) students ~~admitted~~ having dated the opposite sex" **Should read:** "… (36.2%) students reportedly had dated …" **RESULTS, Para 2, next line** **(ii) Reads now:** "…(43.1%) students ~~admitted~~ that someone had…" **Should read:** "…(43.1%) students reported that someone had…" **And so on and so forth….** Numerous more examples that need being rectified	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Germany**