



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_18911
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED INFECTIONS (STIs) AMONG UNDERGRADUATES ATTENDING UNIVERSITY HEALTH CARE CENTRE IN BAYELSA STATE, NIGERIA
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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Thank you for asking me to review this manuscript titled “prevalence of sexually transmitted infections among undergraduates attending university health care centre in Bayelsa State, Nigeria”. The manuscript has merit considering the peculiarity of undergraduates in Nigeria whereby previous studies had shown an increased level of risky sexual behaviour. The study employed a cross-sectional purposive design.</p> <p>Title: Based on the study design used in the methodology section of the study i.e., retrospective research design the title is not appropriate for prevalence study. The design of this study was a cross sectional. I suggest the title be changed to: “Sexually</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>transmitted infections among undergraduates seen at a University Health Centre in Bayelsa State, Nigeria: a 5 years retrospective study”.</p> <p>Abstract: One hundred and eighty eight words were used for the unstructured abstract. There was no background information to state the problem or justify the study. The author did not state the objective of the study. The study design and data collection method should be stated. For example, the material and methods could read “medical records of students who visited the University Health Centre from date of commencement to date of conclusion were reviewed. Socio-demographic and clinical data were extracted using a check list (either developed by the author or adapted from a previous study or from a standard tool from WHO/CDC etc). It is not sufficient to state that “data obtained were analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>(SPSS-20.0)". The author should state how the data are described and state the test of association that was employed for the study. The level of significance should also be stated. A sentence on recommendation (if any) is desirable at this stage too.</p> <p>Key Words: The key words should include prevalence, International Classification of Diseases, Bayelsa State while University Medical Center should be one word. The word undergraduate is globally understood and need not be a key word.</p> <p>Introduction: The author should clearly illustrate the gap in the literature the current study is trying to fill. Repeated references to CDC tend to portray that this issue is not well researched elsewhere. The introduction should be well arranged and written in the conventional way with background information, statement of the problem then Justification. The general and specific objectives</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

should be well stated as well. In searching for literature, the sequence should be global to the continent, region and then local. The haphazard and non-sequential ways the literature review was presented should be addressed. Some statements were incomplete. Sentences should begin with a capital letter. Citation of referencing within the text are better highlighted at the end of a sentence/statements rather than in-between sentences unless the reference is particularly relevant to only part of a sentence. The author should pay particular attention to sentences in lines 33, 37, 39, 43, 62, 73, 77 and 83.

Materials and Methods: Method was detailed however there are some unnecessary repetitions How was the check list used for this study obtained? Was it developed by the author? If Yes. Was it pre-tested. If Yes. Where was this done? Was it adapted? If yes. From which source? Was it A WHO/CDC tool? Give reference.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>The author should indicate that the study design was cross sectional and not retrospective design. The total population served by this clinic should also be stated. What is the state of medical and laboratory equipments in this medical center? Was etiologic approach at times to diagnose gonorrhea and syphilis using gram staining and syphilis check rapid tests, respectively? Does this clinic use the syndromic approach to diagnose and treat STIs. Was there any form of counseling/sexuality education given to the clients which may explain progressive decline in the prevalence of STIs from lower academic level to 500 levels? Was detailed sexual history taking, socio-demographic characteristics, and detailed clinical signs and symptoms with elaboration of the chief complaints well recorded? How much of physical examination was performed? Was it systematically and meticulously carried out? Were speculum examinations part of the physical</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>examination in females?. Was proctoscopy available in the clinic?</p> <p>It is equally important for the author to have carried out a key informant interview to enrich the data. However, there was no indication that this was done. Were there inclusion/exclusion criteria? If none; then the author should state that all the 342 patients who visited the clinic with STIs symptoms during the study period were included in the study. In carrying this study, was only the author that partook or the services of research assistants were employed. If yes. Did these assistants undergo any training trained? It is important to define ICD 9 and 10 at this stage. The issue of ethical should be well defined. Which organ of the University granted this approval? The author should take note that the plural for datum i.e. data should be qualified with are/were as appropriate.</p> <p>Results: Although the author made some deductions it is very</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>difficult to conclude that the results of this study answered its objectives since the objective(s) was/were not stated ab initio. The standard method of labeling a table is to present it on top of the table while charts/graphs are at the bottom. The author should revisit all the tables to make necessary corrections as appropriate. In line 117 of the manuscript, the percentages 19.65 % and 19.3% could not be described as majorities. An appropriate word to qualify these percentages should be used. Line 118 should commence with Forty nine (14.4%).... and NOT 49(14.4%). The author should search for more literature to support your discussion in line 142-149. Why didn't you interrogate absenteeism earlier in your literature review /introduction section? You are to also expantiate on your statements in lines 160-164. In line 174, what is the percentage of clients with trichomoniasis? And in line 186, state the percentage with candidiasis.</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Discussion: The author compares findings with other studies nationally and internationally in an analytical manner and gave reasons why STIs were more among 100L compared to 500L undergraduates.</p> <p>Conclusion/Recommendation: Some of the conclusions are based on the discussion. Attempts to make corrections on the identified deficiencies in the results/discussion sections are likely to produce a more robust conclusion/ recommendations.</p> <p>References: The author seems to have conformed to the Vancouver Reference Style. However, references1, 5,6,9,15,19,20,23,24,26 and 30 should revisited and made to conform with best practices. For examples reference 1 and 5 should read,</p> <p>1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.(CDC)</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>[Online]. 2011. [cited 2011 Month Day]. Sexually Transmitted Disease Surveillance data for 2006- 2010. Atlanta, GA. Department of Health and Human Services. Available from: http://www.cdc.gov/std/stats10/toc.htm.</p> <p>5. Mayaud P. and McCormick D. (2001) Interventions against sexually transmitted infections (STI) to prevent HIV infection. British Medical Bulletin 58 (1) 129-153. [DOI: 239 10.1093/bmb/58.1.129 i.e.</p> <p>Surname and initials full stop then 'and' for only 2</p> <p>or 'coma' (more than 2)authors then</p> <p>Year of publication then</p> <p>Title of article then</p> <p>Title of journal then</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Volume then issue number and finally</p> <p>Page numbers. Similar corrections should be</p> <p>applied to other source of references such as</p> <p>books, conference papers, pamphlet etc..</p> <p>To conclude, I believe that when the authors make</p> <p>the corrections as suggested he will arrive at some</p> <p>different conclusions that will enrich the paper. <i>End</i></p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	ne	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>General Comment: There are various typographical errors and some incomplete statements or inappropriate two-letter words such as ‘on’ placed in certain places. The abstract was deficient in essential substance such as objective and methodology. The introduction was disjointed, inadequate and difficult to follow. Although the discussion attempted to link the study with previous attempts, it failed to properly interrogate the various factors listed in a succinct way. The conclusion was brilliant and useful recommendations were made. The referencing was Vancouver but most of the references were poorly presented. Based on the importance of the issue, I suggest a major revision of the manuscript before further consideration could be given to the study.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Saliu Tosho Abdulsalam</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Community Medicine, Ladoke Akintola University Teaching Hospital, Oyo State, Nigeria</i>