



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International STD Research & Reviews |
| Manuscript Number: | 2014_I-SRR_15859 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED INFECTIONS AMONG THE PEOPLE OF EKITI, SOUTH-WEST, NIGERIA; A CASE STUDY OF HBV, HCV AND SYPHILIS. |
| Type of the Article | Case Study |

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 | <p>The study is a good attempt by the researcher(s) and it is an issue of public health importance, however, there are few grey areas that need to be clarified/corrected</p> <p>TITLE The study is not a community based study, but rather a hospital based study carried out among clients that visited the hospital (who may be ill, though may be apparently healthy) and thus cannot be used as a true reflection of Ekiti community as a whole, hence the title could be modified as thus:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED INFECTIONS AMONG CLIENTS VISITING A TERTIARY HEALTH INSTITUTION IN EKITI STATE, NIGERIA; A CASE STUDY OF HBV, HCV AND SYPHILIS" <p>OR</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. "SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED INFECTIONS AMONG CLIENTS VISITING EKITI STATE UNIVERSITY TEACHING HOSPITAL; A CASE STUDY OF HBV, HCV AND SYPHILIS" <p>OR AS THE RESEARCHER(S) DEEM FIT, BUT THE FACT THAT THE STUDY WAS CARRIED OUT AMONG HOSPITAL CLIENTS SHOULD BE REFLECTED IN THE TITLE</p> | <p>TITLE I quite agree with you that the study was conducted in the named tertiary institution but i want you to know that the named health institution is the only tertiary health institution owned by the state government in Ekiti and is not only the sick people that come to screen themselves for the infections, many people from across the whole state usually visit this institution to screen themselves for the infections e.g couple-to-be, are usually referred from different churches across the state to this institution to screen themselves for these infections before proceeding on marriage arrangement proper, people come for screening for employment purpose (both public and private sectors), potential blood donors are also screened and some people usually come for the screening just to know their status. So i believe using the data to represent Ekiti people is not a bad idea if you would reason with me.</p> |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p><u>METHODOLOGY</u></p> <p>STUDY AREA AND POPULATION: DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA SHOULD PRECEDE THE STUDY SUBJECTS AND THE STUDY AREA SHOULD GIVE A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE TERTIARY HEALTH INSTITUTION AS WELL AS THE HAEMATOLOGY DEPARTMENT</p> <p>METHODS: AUTHOR(S) SHOULD PLEASE INDICATE IF ALL THE CLIENTS THAT WENT THROUGH THE FIRST STAGE OF THE SCREENING WERE TESTED AGAIN WITH ELISA FOR CONFIRMATION OR ONLY THOSE THAT WERE POSITIVE FROM THE RAPID TEST SCREENING WENT THROUGH CONFIRMATORY TEST? THIS IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE OF THE FINANCIAL BURDEN ON A CLIENT WHO MAY NOT REQUIRE "ELISA" OR WAS THERE A WAY OF SHIFTING THE FINANCIAL BURDEN FROM THE CLIENTS? IN ADDITION, FOR THOSE THAT WERE FOUND POSITIVE DURING THE STUDY PERIOD, WERE THEY REFERRED TO THE APPROPRIATE AUTHORITIES/PHYSICIANS FOR PROPER MANAGEMENT? THIS IS ALSO IMPORTANT AS IT WILL SERVE AS BENEFITS FOR CLIENTS THAT TESTED POSITIVE TO ANY OF THE STIs</p> | <p><u>Methodology</u></p> <p>Noted.</p> <p><u>Methods:</u></p> <p>All the people screened with RTK were also confirmed using ELISA because RTK sometimes give erroneous results which could be due to the factory errors on the kit and lower sensitivity of the kits compared to ELISA, and the screening were done at a subsidized rate. All individuals positive to any of the infections were referred to the appropriate quarter.</p> |
|--|--|--|



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | <p>In the abstract and methods sections, 4mls (figure) is not advisable to start a sentence, it may be changed to words or a word should precede the figure “Syphilis is the oldest known sexually transmitted infection (STI)”this statement as stated in the introduction section of the manuscript may need to be referenced</p> <p>The discussion should be written in past tense and it is also advisable for researcher(s) to give plausible reasons for the similarities and differences seen in their research and previous ones</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The statements ‘Syphilis is the oldest known..., It is caused by a bacterium known as... and It can take up to 3months...’ all have the same reference and that is why the reference was put at the end of the whole statements.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | <p>All other typographical/grammatical errors should be modified as appropriate</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |