



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_13342
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDE ON PREVENTION OF MOTHER TO CHILD TRANSMISSION OF HIV AMONG PREGNANT WOMEN ATTENDING ANTENATAL CLINIC AT KISII LEVEL FIVE HOSPITAL IN KISII COUNTY, KENYA.
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	The manuscript is written in English of an unacceptable quality. It requires editing to improve errors of grammar which appear throughout the text. The repeated error of concord throughout the manuscript requires attention. Abstract claims a systematic random sampling. The methodology section reveals convenience sampling was used. This form of misrepresentation is unacceptable at publication level, and raises serious concern about the methodological integrity of the study. Clarification is required on whether informed consent was obtained from study respondents. A review of the reporting of study results is necessary. In the results section, the use of incorrect terminology such as “positively related” should be replaced with more specific terms such as “association”. In table 2, for example, a “positive” relationship is not possible as the both variables are nominal categorical variables, and directionality in association is therefore not possible. Pie charts should not be used to represent data with three or less categories (eg. Yes/No/Maybe). The discussion section of the paper has not been limited to the findings of the study. Repeated discussion points are made where study results are attributed to “willingness to disclose HIV status”. However, information on disclosure, or willingness to disclose HIV status was not collected in this study. The author/s claim, for example, that that younger age was associated with a lack of willingness to disclose HIV status, but the this study did not test for such information. Care must be taken to limit the claims of the paper to the results of the research.	The whole manuscript was edited to correct grammar. A systematic random sampling was used to select the respondents; the error at the methodology is corrected. Clarification is made. Incorrect terminologies is corrected to more appropriate terms i.e. ‘positively related’ is replaced with ‘association’ and the pie charts also replaced. Findings that were omitted are inserted to clearly reflect the discussions.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION	Line 58 - “reduced up to 2%” – should read “reduced to 2%”. Possibly	Corrected to read reduced to...



SDI Review Form 1.6

comments	under 2%? Line 71 – 78 Requires referencing – Statements of fact have been made in these sentences. Line 85 – 87. Please individually reference the studies mentioned in this paragraph. Line 110 – 112 – Please qualify the statement regarding the fecundity of African women. It is not “estimated” that “African women tend to have more children than elsewhere in the world” Please use the UNAIDS terminology guidelines for HIV. For example, I suggest “ARVs” should be replaced by “ART”. “HIV/AIDS” should be replaced by more specific terminology - refer to said guidelines. Line 151 - 152. Please refrain from using “HIV+” and “HIV-” as references to disease status. In the results section, the use of incorrect terminology such as “positively related” should be replaced with more specific terms such as “association”. In table 2, for example, a “positive” relationship is not possible as the both variables are nominal categorical variables, and directionality in association is therefore not possible.	A reference is inserted. The statement is quantified. UNAIDS terminologies such as ART and reactive persons are used. ‘positively related’ is replaced with association
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	While the study is poorly written up, there was a worthy study question and a meaningful attempt to answer the study question. The authors unfortunately fail to present the rich information generated in a well-considered form. Nonetheless, the study contributes to the body of knowledge crucially required to scale up PMTCT services in Africa. The authors make an important contribution to the location/country-specific knowledge on some of the issues related to their PMTCT programme. Was ethical approval obtained from a designated Ethics Committee? No Approval number, nor the name of the approved ethical authority is given in the manuscript. There is no mention of consent.	Ethical approval was obtained from Kisii Level 5 Hospital Administration Committee.