



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJESBS_22906
Title of the Manuscript:	Psychosocial and behavioural correlates of HIV risk perception among workers of Mukete Estates Limited, Meme Division, Southwest region of Cameroon
Type of the Article	Original research Articles

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: the use of the odds ratio expression is not recommended. It is asked to do a results interpretation. E.g. Muslims have 2,8 more likelihood to ... Study population: line 147 – should include the number or ‰ of males and females – and the comparison with the country or region presence of males and females (the last part is minor revision comment) Lines 215; 220; 227 – reports the coding method and is the same in line 206. All perceived variables were all coded on the same way. Eliminate this line on this 4 variables and introduce a line after line 203 where is reported that all perceived variables are coded like: “...” On line 334-335 is recommended to offer the interpretation of the odds results – like the example given after for the abstract. All odds results should be presented interpreted. Is recommended to do the alteration for the full article.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Method analysis: recommendation to eliminate from line 257 to 271 where are explained the assumptions of BLR. As this is not an article about testing any statistical model, just the use of one, the explanation of the assumptions are not necessary neither recommended. What is important the author already have it after line 271, is that the study has verified the assumptions to use BLR.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The research is a tremendous contribute to the HIV field, very well performed and is highly recommended to the authors to to do the brief revision to their results analysis so the study can be part of the scientific field.	
---	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marta Moreno
Department, University & Country	Universiade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal