



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_26487
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of Dysmenorrhea and its Relationship to School Activities among Senior Secondary School Students in Nnewi, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reference in line 56 was not written well . Methodology was not clear, please write it again more easy . I did not feel that is cross match study it is just descriptive one. The title is important issue but all the content are not. Language is poor , methods , tables and discussions are the same Major revision and rewrite	This has been corrected. Methodology has been written more clearly. The study was descriptive but was done on a cross section of secondary school students; and this makes it a cross sectional (snap short) study as well. The title-content gap has been bridged as much as possible. This has been rectified as much as possible. This has been done.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Table 1, 2: you must write the number of your cases.	The number of cases has been written on the tables.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	How did you classify pain is mild, moderate or severe. Discussion has no benefit and you did not discuss or compare your work by the others.	The emphasis of the write-up is on 'perception' of pain (not necessarily standardized classification of pain). This varies from person to person. How this perception influenced their intervention was then elicited. Some other works have now been compared with our findings.