



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 <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	Under the Study Participants section: -Elaborate on why women coming for first visit were excluded Under Sampling Technique section: -Explicitly elaborate on the inclusion and exclusion criteria Study Instruments section: Elaborate on the instrument and including the following information: - Validity and reliability of the instrument - Number of questions included (move this from the data analysis section) - Further information about the variables and what exactly was asked in the questionnaire relating to the variables	-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 -This has been addressed under study participants - There is no existing standardized or validated tool. It was therefore validated for content and construct by pretesting in another region comparable to the study area and modifying the tools in line with findings - Has been moved. - See study tools attached as appendix



SDI Review Form 1.6

	d) Was the instrument self-administered e) Duration to complete the questionnaire Results section: The manner in which the information/data is presented is not clear. I recommend restricting the section as follows: Information on urban or rural area presented first and use terms such as “in comparison to” “versus” to the other setting. The way it is presented it overwhelming and does not flow as easily as it should. Discussion section: There was some repetition of the results. It is recommend to re-work the discussion to answer the “so what” which would highlight the importance/significant of this project. Limitations section to be included.	d. Already stated interviewer administered....see study instruments section e. Not clear as if it is duration for individuals is very varied -I think this has been well addressed. There are many varies and addressing all urban before rural will not adequately show the comparison and will equal increase the volume to work without extra meaning -effected
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Overall, this research study and the findings are of great value and relevance to HIV prevention. The introduction clearly situates the impact of the transmission of HIV from mothers to infants and justifies the importance of assessing the knowledge, attitude and practice among pregnant women to reduce the transmission of HIV. Minor revisions include: Line 57: one comma after the word women Lin 57-69, the reference used is 2008 and 2009, these are quite outdated, recommended including more current statistics/evidence. Line 63: comma to be inserted after “Sub-Saharan Africa” Line 74: used the acronyms ART and ARV—recommend first spelling it out- Antiretroviral Therapy before using the acronym. Line 88: missing a period after provided. Line 89-90: restructure the sentence to read—The Government of Nigeria has been committed to HIV prevention, which is guided by the National HIV/AIDS Strategic Plan 2010-2015 that emphasizes... Line 92: “remained” to be changed to “remain” Line 98: insert comma after “on average” Line 99: indicate what the acronym ANC stands for. This was done later on in the paper under the sampling technique.	-effected -very sorry, this is what we could find as most recent. Figures were quoted in 2010 edition -effected -corrected -inserted -modified -changed -inserted -indicated
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 115: insert comma after “to achieve this,”	-inserted
	Line 128; Insert comma after “politically”	-inserted
	Line 130: insert period after “2006 census figures”	-inserted
	Line 134: Insert semi-colon after “includes”	-inserted
	Line 155: to read—“A multistage” instead of “The multistage”	-changed
	Line 157: 30 instead of thirty; 44 instead of forty four	-changed
	Line 158: insert comma after rural LGA.	-inserted
	Line 158: to read—“From there, 5 health....”	-effected
	Line 159: mothers	-effected
	Line 171: How was the grading that was used for knowledge, attitude and practice determined?	-included
	Line 190-191: indicate there were statistically significant differences for marital status, educational level and employment—what was the difference pertaining to? Knowledge? Attitude? Clarification warranted.	-this has to do with table socio-demographic variables.....clarified
	Line 194: replace “while” with “however”	-changed
	Line 200-202: recommend restructuring The terms rural and urban were used throughout, it is recommended to indicate urban setting and rural setting.	-modified
	Line 222-223: not clear if the 88.0% is referring to the rural setting. Please clarify.	-is rural and modified



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 227: not clear—"rural are of the opinion that..." Line 249-251: recommend restructuring to make it clearer.	-modified.....respondents added -restructured
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		