



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Education, Society &amp; Behavioural Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BJESBS_27833</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluation of Socio-psychologic factors that impede/promote Voluntary Counseling Test (VCT) services among youths in Anambra State</b>
Type of the 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Please clarify the ethical issue:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Was ethical clearance sought from any ethics board? Is verbal permission from elders enough for this survey? The ethical issue is not satisfactory. Please explain</li> <li>- The sampling procedure needs to be more clear as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ How was the sample size of 400 reached? What is the power of your findings? I am not a statistician but you need to show this is statistically acceptable to sample only 400 youth from 137,074 (<math>\approx 0.3\%</math>)</li> <li>➤ The sampling was done from churches, football grounds etc....please mention how each youth in this centres were selected for the questionnaire. How many churches, football grounds and schools did you visit?</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Each responses in the results may be better interpreted showing in frequency and percentage as well, not just frequency</li> <li>- Need to improve the discussion further probably discussing individual findings as far as possible and relating them to the local context relevancy</li> <li>- Need to improve the English language and overall write up</li> </ul>	I do not see anything wrong with the comments but all the answers are already in the work. Those that were not there initially have been added
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- May include international and local data from other similar studies in the introduction if available?</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		