



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJESBS_27833
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Socio-psychologic factors that impede/promote Voluntary Counseling Test (VCT) services among youths in Anambra State
Type of the Article	empirical

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	<p>This manuscript addresses an important public health issue related to HIV testing. Additionally, this study has several strengths including a reasonably large sample which was chosen through random selection, and approval for study gotten from community leaders.</p> <p>The Methods section has several weaknesses in that the authors do not describe in sufficient detail what they did. In the methods section the authors stated, "The instrument of data collection was questionnaire." What questionnaire was it? What does the questionnaire validly measure? I see that they did split half reliability and the .85 coefficient is adequate, but reliability is a prerequisite, but its not a measure of validity. In the results section the authors did not write the specific analyses and results via F/t or p values. Also in the discussion section there are several bulleted statements, but it is often informative to integrate current findings with previous research and to put the current research findings in context by outlining limitations of the study. With some editing this manuscript is publishable.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Robert perna</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>TIRR, USA</i>