SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	This article is a good attempt to know the psychosocial and behavioural correlates of HIV risk perception among workers in Cameroon using the health belief model. However there are some major flaws such as sample size is not enough to describe the interpretation or generalized the statements. That may be the main reason that the confidence intervals of the multivariate analyses show wider ranges in most of the cases. I am afraid whether author has used "binomial logistic regression" or "binary/multiple logistic regression". I think multiple logistic regression is a better word for this. In method section no need to write the assumptions as it is understandable by the readers. Author should also mention that which confidence intervals were used (e.g. 95% or 99% or 90%) in this study in data and methods section. The odds ratios represented here in the papers are unadjusted (in table-3), which is not much useful if you compared with adjusted. It is always better to use the adjusted OR in the results write up and discussion. Kindly rewrite the results and discussion using the adjusted ORs. The conclusion part is too small. Conclusion section can be re written in a better way which will help the reader/policy maker/ programmer to take home message and future research need. This paper required one more round of English editing by a professional before resubmission.	
Minor REVISION comments	There are many small paragraphs in different sections of the paper. The author should rethink to merge some of the paragraphs to make a better sense and should be	

	more representable. Table -2 is too long (it has been presented in three pages) to be presented in international level journals. Author should rethink to present these things in better way (by mix of graphs and tables) In Table-1, kindly remove the star and other symbol used to present the characteristics of the variables. In Table-3, use the adjusted ORs and make the changes accordingly. Secondly, kindly mention which CIs values were used here. No need to put the Wald statistics, as the ORs is supported by CIs and P-values.	
Optional/General comments	This paper has the potential to be published after making the necessary changes in the paper.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Population Council, New Delhi, India**