



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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Abstract: Condense the introduction to one sentence. There are far too many mistakes in grammar and sentence structure to list them here. All of the grammar mistakes must be corrected before this manuscript can be properly reviewed. The abstract presents many conclusions that are not supported by facts presented in the abstract. The following must be removed from the abstract: The abstract states: The utilization of the PMTCT services were affected by the low levels of HIV testing But there does not appear to be any evidence presented to support his statement "The insufficient knowledge on PMTCT coupled with the negative attitude towards HIV testing, fear and stigma towards HIV and AIDS" appears in the abstract but the only correlation presented in the abstract is concerning age and occupation. There is no data presented on attitudes towards testing, fear or stigmatization. "There is need to increase on the capacity building of the health workers in the PMTCT service provision especially in the areas of counseling and testing to	Introduction is condensed to two paragraphs The whole manuscript is edited to correct grammar. Findings that were earlier omitted are inserted.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	avoid delays.” There is no data presented in the abstract concerning capacity building, health care workers, counseling or delays. “without causing conflicts in the family.” There is no data presented in the abstract concerning conflicts in the family. Introduction The paragraph beginning “The risk of MTCT can be reduced up” is repeated twice. Remove one of the two One of the problem statements is: The purpose of this study was to assess the acquisition of knowledge The second problem statement is to assess knowledge and attitude on PMTCT These are two different and conflicting objectives. Are you trying to assess the knowledge or the acquisition of knowledge? Every paragraph in the literature review is redundant to the information presented in the introduction and problem statement. This entire section should be eliminated.	One paragraph deleted
--	--	------------------------------



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The question: “Have you ever heard of PMTCT” (table 1) seems to be very poorly worded. Perhaps they have heard of the concept of mother-to-child transmission and its prevention but simply have never heard of the acronym. All of the tables should be eliminated from this paper. Only present the most essential raw data and summary data for the remaining information. Almost all of the figures of this paper should be eliminated. Just present the one or two most important figures and summarize the remaining data. Some of the results/data presented do not match-up with the data provided. For example, Lines 287-289 asserts that respondents 26 and older were more knowledgeable because they were exposed to different sources of information and they were more experienced with antenatal issues because they were always coming to the Health Centre. The data presented does not support the latter assertion. It would be helpful if the author(s) were consistent and therefore accurate throughout the article. For example, in lines 175 & 176 the author(s) say that “The study was conducted from 10 March, 2014 to 28th March 2014...” while in lines 23 & 24 the author(s) say that the study was conducted	Correction done ‘The purpose of the study was to assess knowledge and attitude on PMTCT’ Literature review section is eliminated and an introduction summary done. Changed to read: have you ever heard of the concept of mother to child transmission and its prevention? Some of the tables and figures eliminated and a summary done. Some of the findings earlier omitted are included.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	“...from February to April, 2014”. Lines 30 & 31 state that “...respondents who had little or no knowledge of the services were mostly below 20 years of age...” Throughout the rest of the article, data is provided for 15-25 year old respondents but never for 20 years or below. The abstract says a simple random sample was used, methods say a convenience sample was used. Actually, it appears to be a census of all mothers coming to clinic. Too much of the discussion and nearly all of the recommendations are based on speculation that goes well beyond the data presented.	Corrected to read below 25 years old. A systematic random sampling was used Some of the findings earlier omitted are included to defend the discussions.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Shorten the first few paragraphs of the introduction to just one paragraph. Most of the data covered here are already known by your likely readers. The paper could begin where the author states “Problem Statement”	The introduction is summarised into two paragraphs.
Optional/General comments	This paper is very poorly written. There are far too many grammar errors to understand the authors meaning in many places. There are too many figures and little attempt to summarize the data. The conclusions and discussions go far beyond the data presented.	