



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_26615
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission of HIV; Socio-economic determinants of knowledge, attitude and practice among pregnant women in Abia State, 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 (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	1. Manuscript needs thorough English grammatical revisions. 2. Study objective should be in line with study title. 3. Uniform style should be used in writing of results especially in decimal place. 4. Instead writing p-value equal to any number, authors can write p-value like as $p < 0.05$ or $p < 0.001$. 5. Author/s should write unit of measurement with values e.g.: age in years. 6. Author/s had not mentioned references in the several lines (e.g.: In Introduction- lines 35, 43, 57, 60-61, 64, 70, 73, 75, 78, 97, 99-101, 107, 113; In Discussion- lines 290-291, 297, 306, 308, 328, 337, 351, 353, 366, 371-378). 7. In exclusion criteria, author/s should write about why they had excluded the first ANC visitors 8. In <u>Sample Size calculation</u>, the two proportion formula is used for sample size calculation and 350 is estimated with P1 as urban and P2 as rural. This 350 should not be divided into two groups; however, it should have collected separately from each urban and rural populations. 9. Author/s should mention about design effect and non-response (if any) in sample size calculation.	1. grammatical revisions effected 2. modified as suggested 3. uniform style in decimal place effected 4. all changed/modified 5. unit added 6. inserted 7. those coming for first visit were excluded as they have come for booking/registration and it is after this that you have records/folder and counted as being part of ANC. Based on this including them will introduce a bias 8. the correction formula for population $< 10,000$ was used to get the final value studied. This has been reflected in body of work - methodology 9. added at methodology- sample size



SDI Review Form 1.6

	10. Manuscript needs more details about sampling techniques 11. Author/s should provide reference in using grading approach for analysis and also show the scores for indicators and calculation of mean score for knowledge, attitude & practice. 12. Author/s can use <u>Currently Married Women</u> instead of <u>Married till date</u> in marital status & <u>Higher</u> instead of <u>Tertiary</u> in Educational status. 13. In table-2, Author/s should specify how they had calculated percentage of Indicator- Knowledge on ways HIV can be transmitted. Is it a composite indicator or directly asked in questionnaire from respondents? If it was directly asked from respondents then for ways denominators should be 170 instead of 175. 14. Denominators for <u>"If Yes, it can be during"</u> depends on the answer of the <u>"Infected mother can transmit HIV to child"</u> in table 2. Author/s need to correct it. 15. In table 4, "Result of HIV result" can be "Result of HIV testing", please cross check it. If it is "Result of HIV testing", then Denominator of "Result of HIV testing" depends up on "Ever tested for HIV". Please check it.	10. details added 11. already explained at data analysis section 12. modified as suggested but used <u>currently married</u> as respondents were women 13. very sorry, it was a mistake and has been removed as 'knowledge of unprotected sex' was 100 percent in urban showing that all knew at least one form of transmission. So denominator is 175 not 170 14. has been corrected 15. has been corrected
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	16. In table 4, "Possibility of telling your husband to use condom" may be presented separately. 17. In tables 6-8, only good/ positive results may be presented in single table. The column percent may be used and not chi-square comparison is required. 18. Table 9 should have all socio-demographic variables for knowledge, attitude and practice according to rural/ urban. The univariable model info may be appended as supplementary materials.	16. presented as a distinct table 17. the table was left as it as we are testing for association not just proportion 18. Sorry not very clear to us. Do you suggest I include separate table for knowledge, attitude and practice. If so, I feel there will be so many tables.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	19. "No" Column may be deleted from tables 2, 3, 4. 20. The table 5 is not required as a separate table. It should be discussed in the text only. 21. In table 6, 7 & 8, Author/s had used abbreviation HCWs. What is it?	19. has been removed 20. has been removed and discussed as suggested 21. mistake and has been replaced with respondents