



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_14198
Title of the Manuscript:	Utilization of HIV Testing and Counseling Services by Men in the Bolgatanga Municipality
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewers report 1. There are lots of typographic errors, incorrect statements and tenses. 2. Abbreviations need to be written in full first. 3. Introduction – a. Verbose b. Lengthy c. Poor written d. Poorly presented e. Should better serve as literature review than introduction. 4. Needs to be completely rewritten and kept within the confines of the aims and objective of the study.	1. The manuscript has undergone systematic editing by English-speaking proofreaders. 2. Abbreviations such as HIV, CDC, VCT, CHPS, and GDHS have been written in full first before they are subsequently used. 3. The introduction has been rewritten and separated from the literature review to make it more concise. 4. The introduction has been rewritten and restricted to the aims and objectives of the study. 5. The methodology has been



SDI Review Form 1.6

	5. Methodology. a. Verbose b. Lengthy c. Confusing d. Not chronological e. disjointed 1. Also needs to be rewritten and also addressing the following a. How did you collect names of the households? b. Where were the “pickings” done c. Where, when , who and how was the counseling done d. How many people enrolled declined e. Did you use both interview method and questionnaires for data collection or was it a researcher administered questionnaire	systematically summarized and revised to include how names of the households were collected, where the “picking” was done, the number of people who declined after enrolment and other questions asked by the reviewer. The data collection was by a researcher administered questionnaire. This has been clearly stated in the methodology. The introductory letter was written by my head of department at the time, i.e. The Department of Population, Family and Reproductive Health (PFRH) of the School of Public Health, University of Ghana, as this research served as my dissertation for my master of public health degree. It was written during the data collection period. However, I have deleted this aspect from the manuscript so as to reduce the length. The results section has been duly revised to include the suggestions
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	f. Who wrote the introductory letter and at what stage of the study g. Community and household heads are they the same persons h. How did you ensure confidentiality i. How did you identify the individual questionnaires j. Learn to use the appropriate register eg – the study was conducted using pretested , semi – structures questionnaires --- Results 1. ALSO VERBOSE 2. Results shown as tables need not be repeated as prose 3. Two row tables should be deleted Discussion 1. Remove the headings, 2. Delete results repeated in this section	by the reviewer. Repeated results have been deleted from the discussion section. However, the authors will like to keep the headings under the discussion to make the discussion relating to the research objectives clearly stand out. Besides, the journal guidelines do not forbid subheadings under the discussion section. The conclusion has been slightly modified to exclude results or explanation of how the conclusion was reached.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3. Use paragraphs 4. Endeavour to address just your aims and objectives Conclusion 1. Just give your conclusions – no need for results or explanations on how the conclusion was reached.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		